DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 067 721 CS 500 027

AUTHOR Kennicott, Patrick C.
TITLE Sources of Funds for Speech Communication Research: The Federal Government (Part 1) and Private Sector (Part 2).
INSTITUTION Speech Communication Association, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE [71]
NOTE 97p.
AVAILABLE FROM Speech Communication Association, Statler Hilton Hotel, New York, N.Y. 10001 ($2.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Communication (Thought Transfer); *Educational Research; Federal Programs; *Financial Support; *Foundation Programs; Grants; Language Arts; Private Financial Support; *Research Proposals; Resource Allocations

ABSTRACT

This document provides a review of sources of funds for research and development in speech communication. Part 1 identifies major general purpose federally-sponsored programs funding unsolicited proposals. The report explains the programs and suggests strategies to use when applying for grants from the Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities. The appendices include a list of regional OE research offices and addresses; the 1972 OE research budget; a guide to 1972 OE administered research programs; and a selected guide to government agencies and personnel. Part 2 provides a definition and developmental history of private foundations, brief descriptions of fourteen major foundations, and suggestions for securing foundation funds. The appendices for Part 2 include a list of foundation libraries, an outline of how a foundation grant is processed, a classification of research proposal shortcomings, and a list of fields from 1961 to 1970 of grants of $10,000 or more. Both Part 1 and Part 2 conclude with appropriate bibliographies. (Author/RN)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 067721

SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR SPEECH COMMUNICATION RESEARCH:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT (PART I)

AND

PRIVATE SECTOR (PART II)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

by

PATRICK C. KENNICOTT
ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH - SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION

CS 500 047

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Speech Communication Assn.
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

ED 067721

PART I

SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR SPEECH COMMUNICATION RESEARCH
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

BY

PATRICK C. KENNICOTT
ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH

PREFACE

The material in the following pages is intended to be of maximum utility for the teacher and scholar in the field of speech communication. The utility criteria had a substantial effect on the form and substance of the document. The material was mimeographed, not printed, to allow last minute changes in the manuscript and to hasten the publication process. Furthermore, names of program officers, deadline dates, FY 1972 budgetary information, and other kinds of specific data were included for their immediate usefulness in full recognition of the fact that the inclusion of such data would date the document shortly after dissemination.

Our intention is to publish a new edition of this document each fall as an update on the latest information concerning Federal research and development programs. We, in the Office of Research, would welcome your reaction to the information that follows, your suggestions and admonitions.

A word of sincere appreciation is due to several individuals who participated in the development of this document but who are in no way responsible for its weaknesses. The Research Board of the Speech Communication Association, Frederick Williams, Lloyd Bitzer, and Gerald Miller, offered helpful comments and encouragement, as did William Work, Executive Secretary, and Robert Hall, Associate Executive Secretary, of the Association. And particular thanks is due to my able secretary, Miss Sherry Tobak, for her cheerful assistance and meaningful contribution.

Patrick C. Kennicott
Associate Executive Secretary
for Research
October 29, 1971

CONTENTS

PREFACE ii

INTRODUCTION 1

GENERAL PURPOSE UNSOLICITED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION RESEARCHER 5

Office of Education
National Science Foundation
National Endowment

SECURING A FEDERAL GRANT FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT 22

Need-Oriented Research
Audience Analysis
Pre-submission Negotiation
Careful Attention to Specifications
Utilization of Feedback
Other Federal Programs

APPENDICES

A. U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION REGIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM . . 27

B. OFFICE OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 1972 BUDGET 29

C. GUIDE TO OE-ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS, FISCAL YEAR 1972, GROUP IV: FOR RESEARCH 31

D. SELECTED GUIDE TO AGENCIES AND PERSONNEL 35

BIBLIOGRAPHY 38

INTRODUCTION

Almost two years ago, Congressman William V. Roth set out to catalog all currently operating Federal assistance programs. The result of his endeavor was a congressional document (No. 91-177) 1,131 pages long describing 1,315 Federal assistance programs funding everything from the writing of leaflets on the care and feeding of monkies in captivity to the actual care and feeding of college teachers (the latter being, of course, the NDEA College Teacher Graduate Fellowships program). Most of us would generously call that a wide range. It is no wonder that the year before the Roth study, Ronald A. Wolk wrote:

> There is probably no single person--perhaps not any single agency--in or out of government who can define with accuracy all of the ways in which the Federal Government channels funds to American higher education or the amount of money actually spent or obligated for all of these programs. The funds come from more than forty agencies; they ride piggy-back on legislation which, at first glance, seems to have no connection at all with higher education. . . .Statistics are compiled and used in various ways which generally make them uncomparable and somewhat unreliable; budget requests, estimated obligations, authorizations, and actual expenditures all run together, [illegible] spilling across fiscal years and academic years, comingling loans and grants, and research funds and training funds. Much important information is simply not available, and that which is becomes obsolete almost as soon as it is recorded.[1]

The funding picture that was complex two years ago is even more complex today since Federal involvement in every sphere of American education, secondary and higher, public and private, traditional and non-traditional, has continued to escalate in terms of the amount of the Federal contribution and the percentage of the Federal contribution in proportion to local, state and "other" committments. The problem of identifying major education funding programs is compounded by the large volume of education-oriented legislation perpetually before Congress and the increasing involve-

---

[1]Ronald A. Wolk, Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education (Berkeley, California: Carnegie Commission, 1968), p. ix.

ment of numerous Federal agencies*--not just the Office of Education--in the support of a wide variety of educational programs. Further, every shift of Washington political winds produces extensive changes in personnel administering educational support programs and thereby in the programs themselves.

The objective of this report is to identify, within the maze of Federal aid-to-education programs, major general purpose, unsolicited research and development programs accessible to the speech communication researcher. To identify every Federal program that offers support for speech communication research and development is beyond the scope of this document and probably out of the realm of possibility. From one point of view, every Federal agency, by virtue of its inherent interest, directly or indirectly, in effective communication, is a potential consumer of the results or "products" of speech communication research. On the other hand, we have yet to discover any single Federal program that is exclusively devoted to the support of speech communication research and development.

At the outset, several preliminary points of clarification are warrented.

First, by "general purpose" research and development programs we refer to those programs open to a relatively wide variety of applicants and appropriate for the speech communication researcher. Only a few major Federal aid programs fall into this category. The rest of them are restricted for utilization by a particular academic discipline or subject area, or for utilization by a particular agency or institution. For example, during Fiscal Year 1972, the Office of Education, through its Multidisciplinary Basic Research Program, is offering "Grants to Support Education Research by Anthropologists." The aim of the program is to encourage anthropologists to increase their involvement in basic research efforts related to educational theory and practice. Since the program is discipline-bound, its funds are not available to the speech communication researcher. Many other research and development programs, such as the Office of Education's Nutrition and Health Pro-

---

*In 1970, approximately 95% of all Federal support to higher education came from eight agencies: Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the largest contributor; National Science Foundation, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Department of the Interior, and Department of Commerce.

gram or the National Institute of Health's Cancer Research Program, are subject-bound and not relevant to the speech communication researcher. Other Federal funding programs are targeted for use by specific organizations such as universities, or public libraries, or State Departments of Education and are therefore not included in this document.

Secondly, by "unsolicited" research and development programs, we refer to the relatively few Federal programs aimed at funding general research and development projects initiated by independent researchers and research groups or organizations. Unfortunately, the great bulk of Federal research and development funds are committed to or "encumbered" by ongoing "institutionalized" projects. For example, while the Office of Education boasts that over 100 million dollars in the FY 1972 budget is earmarked for "educational research," most of it is already committed to the continuing support of programs already in existence. From this sum, the Office of Education must support eleven regional research laboratories, more than a dozen research and development centers*, and at least twelve additional major continuing programs. The independent researcher has, in one sense, become the victim of the institutionalization of Office of Education funds in that research and development monies are locked in and available only to known researchers and research laboratories via direct solicitation from Federal and Federally sponsored agencies.

In spite of the efforts of some conscientious Federal administrators to restrict the institutionalization of research and development funds (Commissioner Marland has boasted that the Office of Education has succeeded in trimming the number of research laboratories from 16 to 12 during the past Fiscal Year), the bureaucratic tendency to encumber and thus control research and development monies continues to plague researchers in every subject area. The net result is that only a relatively few general unsolicited research programs exist. At least the wide variety of methodologies employed by the speech communication researcher with his typical interest in both basic and applied research, give the field an entree to a wider range of unsolicited programs, however few they may be, than those accessible to the strict "humanist" or exclusive empiricist.

---

*The Center for Cognitive Learning, University of Wisconsin, is one of the Research Centers sponsored by the Office of Education. It employs speech communication research personnel and conducts many projects of relevance to the field of speech communication.

Finally, it is important to remember that none of the material contained in this document is "official". Most of the information has been abstracted from "official documents" or secured through personal interviews with Federal administrators. But the frequency of change in personnel within the Federal bureaucracy, the complexity of aid programs, and the ever-changing political winds causing perpetual shifts in agency structure and program definition, cause us to lament the inevitable--that some of the material that is in your hands through this document is already obsolete. None of it is "official."

It should also be noted that the Federal programs identified in the following pages are budgeted and in operation for FY 1972. Money has been allocated (though not yet appropriated) for many of these programs for FY 1973. For numerous reasons, not the least of which is that it will be an election year, additional increases in Federal appropriations to education--including educational research and development--are expected. Hence, it is realistic to assume that most of the programs mentioned in the following pages will continue into Fiscal Year 1973. Of course there will be some deletions and, hopefully, the addition of some new programs. If you encounter a promising program with an application deadline that is already history, a letter to the program staff inquiring about your chances in FY 1973 is appropriate and advisable.

GENERAL PURPOSE UNSOLICITED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR THE SPEECH COMMUNICATION RESEARCHER

As has already been pointed out, it is likely that we could identify programs of interest to the speech communication researcher in every branch--legislative, executive, and judicial--of the government and in most of its agencies. But our primary interest in general purpose, unsolicited research and development funds will confine us to the executive branch, and, in particular, to programs administered by the Office of Education, the largest division of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. We will also identify research and development programs administered by two independent Federal agencies, the National Science Foundation and the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities.

Office of Education

The Office of Education, currently headed by Commissioner of Education, Sidney P. Marland, Jr., became a constituent agency of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1953. It is responsible for collecting and diffusing information useful to the establishment and maintenance of effective school systems, promoting the cause of education throughout the country, and administering Federal financial assistance to education at all levels.

The mission of the Office of Education is currently discharged through more than 100 programs, each of them unique and falling into one of three categories: school systems, higher education and development. The school systems programs are headed by Deputy Commissioner Terrell H. Bell and implemented through one of three bureaus: Education for the Handicapped, Elementary and Secondary Education, and Adult, Vocational and Technical Education. Higher education programs, under Deputy Commissioner Peter P. Muirhead, are implemented through the Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology, the Bureau of Higher Education, and the Institute of International Studies. Development programs, under Deputy Commissioner John R. Ottina, are channelled through the following internal organizations: National Center for Educational Statistics, The Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, Experimental Schools, National Center for Educational Communication, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, and the National Center for Educational Research and Development.

In an attempt to diffuse the administration of education programs, bringing them closer to the people they serve, the Office of Education is increasingly delegating the administration of major programs to the Office of Regional Coordination, administered by Acting Assistant Commissioner Ormando Q.Rodriguez. Regional offices are now located in ten cities throughout the nation (see Appendix A). In addition to administering many formula-based funding programs, the Regional offices administer a small grants program designed to meet the needs of individual educational researchers.

The current (FY 1972) budget for the Office of Education is $5.1 billion. It is the largest educational appropriation ever enacted by Congress, more than $500 million over FY 1971. At this writing, additional major legislation calling for very substantial further increases in Federal educational appropriations during FY 1972 is now before Congress, including funds for Emergency School Assistance, Education Revenue Sharing, a National Institute of Education, a National Foundation for Higher Education, and Higher Education Student Aid Programs. Passage of all of these programs is doubtful to say the least, but Washington education officials are confident of securing at least some supplemental appropriations from Congress before the end of the current Fiscal Year.

The financial picture for the Office of Education's educational research and development programs is encouraging. During the last decade, the Office spent $700 million on "educational research." Commissioner Marland has expressed his determination that educational research will receive an increasingly higher share of the Office of Education's budget in the future. Over $100 million is currently budgeted for educational research and development. Much of this money is earmarked for programs designed to aid "the economically deprived, racially and geographically isolated, untrained and unskilled, handicapped and neglected child." Commissioner Marland has stressed that the future will see more Office of Education funds channelled into research and development programs in areas of special need. In his latest "Report to Congress," Marland stressed:

> We need to know how we can develop a child of deep poverty, the minority child, the child who has been held in economic or ethnic isolation for generations, the child without aspirations in his family or in his environment, the child who comes to school hungry, and leaves hungrier. We must discover how to develop the 500 million American children who bring different languages and different cultures to their schools. They need special help. Nor can we ignore the gifted child,

posessed with talents that we know frequently transcend the ability of his teacher.

It is clear, of course, that the bulk of the Office of Education's appropriations are committed to state educational programs and distributed on a predetermined formula basis. Nonetheless, unencumbered research and development funds are currently available to educational researchers and thus potentially available to the speech communication researcher. They are found in four major programs: Regional Project Research, Unsolicited Basic Research, Applied Research, and Targeted Communications.

Regional Project Research

Small-scale grants requiring a total investment by the Office of Education of no more than $10,000 with a completion schedule of 18 months or less may be awarded to colleges, universities, state departments of education, or other public or private agencies, organizations, groups, or individuals with institutional or organizational sponsorship under the Office of Education's Regional Research Program. The program is designed to: 1) support significant, small-scale educational research projects; 2) facilitate participation in educational research by a broad range of college and university personnel; 3) encourage small colleges to undertake research programs so that students may benefit from having professors who engage in educational research activities; and to 4) provide for direct expiditious handling of proposals.

This program will not fund conferences and seminars or produce film strips, films or text books. However, it will support a wide variety of research and research-related activities including speech communication projects. To be eligible for support administered by the Regional Project Research Program, an activity must 1) be research or research-related (include such activities as the evaluation of instructional systems and units; the assessment of teaching devices, techniques, and practices; and the analysis and evaluation of research results), 2) show promise of improving education, 3) have general (not purely local) applicability, and 4) be directed toward communicable results. Included in these criteria are projects that might be defined as "basic research" and also projects defined as "curriculum development."

The key determinant in awarding a grant under this program is whether the findings of the project will be significant to other groups, institutions, and areas of the country. In no cases are grants awarded for planning proposals. Each proposal

must be able to stand alone as a complete and valid research project. Details of the program are specified in Regional Project Research: Guidelines for Preparing a Proposal, available from Regional Research Program, National Center for Educational Research and Development, Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20002, or from any one of the Office of Education's Regional Offices.

Regional project research accounts for more than 60% of all research proposals submitted to the Office of Education each year, even though the number of dollars allotted to the program is small compared with the amount awarded all educational research work. The program is unique in that it is the only regionally administered educational research program. The regional approach allows the researcher and the reviewer better opportunity to examine closely each other's aims and purposes.

NCERD Basic and Applied Research

The unit charged with the responsibility of administering the bulk of the U. S. Office of Education's Research and Development funds is the National Center for Educational Research and Development (NCERD), currently under the leadership of Associate Commissioner Robert McVity. NCERD supports research activities designed to 1) discover the nature of learning and its relationship to human development; 2) help educators and others find practical answers to educational problems; 3) develop and test materials, procedures, and systems needed to bring about essential and comprehensive educational reforms; 4) evaluate and demonstrate promising alternative educational procedures; and 5) train manpower for the research functions required for continuous and systematic education improvements.

The activities of NCERD fall into three relatively distinct support patterns: 1) unsolicited basic and applied research projects, 2) developmental activities, and 3) manpower and institutional support programs. The Division of Research, under the leadership of Dr. Howard Hjelm, is responsible for managing programs of unsolicited basic and applied research. During FY 1972, approximately two million dollars is available to support various kinds of unsolicited research projects through this division. A much larger sum has been appropriated for maintenance of programs administered by the Division of Research and Development Resources, under the leadership of Dr. Charles Frye. Various research training programs, more than a dozen research and development centers and eleven educational laboratories are administered by this division. Our major concern will be the basic and applied research programs administered by the Research Division.

Unsolicited Basic Research Program

Under the NCERD Unsolicited Basic Research Program, scientists from all areas of inquiry are eligible to submit proposals for basic research which has a strong theoretical orientation and shows promise of adding to the knowledge base upon which the continuous improvement of education depends. Support is also provided for basic research which seeks to produce new concepts and tools for the conduct and management of research. Studies of an applied or solution-oriented nature are not eligible for support in this program.

Competition for the limited funds available through this program is national and, as would be expected, rigorous. Each proposal is evaluated by a review panel of active scientists on the basis of scientific merit, potential for producing information that is relevant to educational theory or practice, the qualifications of the research personnel, and economic efficiency. Proposals are reviewed by one of three panels: social psychology and personality; intelligence, learning and cognitive functioning; and the social sciences.

December 11, 1971 is the postmark deadline for submitting a research proposal to this program during FY 1972. Approximately 20 grants will be awarded. Projects proposed must have a starting date between April 15 and June 15, 1972. Instructions and general information are available from The Basic Unsolicited Research Program, Research Analysis and Allocation Staff, National Center for Educational Research and Development, Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202.

Unsolicited Applied Research Program

The Unsolicited Applied Research Program covers creative projects directed toward solving pressing national educational problems. Decision-oriented studies, exploratory projects, design efforts, and small-scale developmental activities are included. The program is particularly receptive to projects which have high social significance and present major alternatives to existing educational practices through the development of prototypes, models, and technology. The program supports projects covering a broad spectrum of activities ranging from pre-school through higher, adult, and vocational education.

Approximately 30 projects, averaging $100,000 and up to eighteen months duration will be awarded during FY 1972. Basic, or theory-oriented, research proposals are not elegible for support under this program. Similarly, small project proposals, basic and applied, should be submitted to the appropriate Re-

gional Office of the U. S. Office of Education.

Investigators from any discipline at colleges, universities, state departments of education, local schools or other agencies or organizations from the public and private sector, both profit and non-profit are eligible to submit proposals to this program. Postmark deadlines for submitting proposals are November 1, 1971, and January 17, 1972.

Special attention, in the review process, will be given to proposals which present major and unique alternatives to the existing educational practice and are of national and social significance.

Additional information and application forms are available from: Glenn C. Borriegter Chief, Applied Research Branch, National Center for Education Research and Development, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202.

Targeted Communications Projects

The Targeted Communications program is administered by the National Center for Educational Communication, under the direction of Assistant Commissioner Lee G. Burchnail. The program is designed to "increase the utilization of the findings of educational research and development for improving educational practices." Hence, it supports the synthesis, interpretation, and dissemination of research and development results and current best practice information for a variety of specific, non-research audiences. Stated another way, the aim of the program is to provide school districts, universities, and state agencies with information they need to evaluate their current educational programs or to implement improved ones.

The Office of Education encourages the submission of proposals to the targeted communications project that examine the research and related knowledge in a specific educational problem area and interpret and report that knowledge in a manner that is scientifically respectable and with a practical awareness of the constraints under which educators and other institutions operate. The materials from the project proposals must be "targeted," that is, designed to meet the informational needs of specific audiences. Content of the materials must be related to the roles the target audiences play in the educational change process, the reward system within which they operate, their likely prior knowledge of the topic, the time they have available for reading and digesting interpretative materials and other practical concerns.

Submitted proposals are judged on the basis of the **proposer's perception of the problem area he selects and the targeted audiences information needs. Each project must culminate in a report**

to the Office of Education, written for the specific target audience(s) selected by the proposer as a detailed interpretative analysis of research, development, and exemplary practice in the subject area. Depending on the audience and the subject, the information might include cost estimates, planning guidelines, decision models, sources of additional information, evaluation techniques, brief descriptions of exemplary practices, and the like. Projects are reviewed and evaluated on the basis of: national significance and urgency of the topic to be interpreted; technical adequacy of procedures for identifying content and operating problems in schools and institutions of higher education which may impinge on the subject; target audiences to be reached; technical competence of the applicant in the subject matter being proposed; and economic efficiency.

The postmark deadline for submitting proposals for FY 1972 is November 1, 1971. Proposals must be received by the U. S. Office of Education at least twelve weeks before the proposed starting date of the project. A common format and standard application form are required for all proposals. Such materials and additional information are available from: Division of Practice Improvement, National Center for Educational Communication, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202.

Proposals for the four Office of Education general purpose, unsolicited research and development programs identified aimed at resolving needs in the following priority problem areas are most likely to receive a favorable reception: disadvantaged, career education, education for the handicapped, racial integration, early childhood education, reading, innovation.

The "Annual Guide to OE Programs, FY 1972" published in American Education, is available free by writing to the Editor, American Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C. 20202. Multiple copies may be purchased from the Superintendant of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402 at 20¢ each. (When ordering from the GPO, please specify OE-11015072.) This document identifies seven Office of Education construction programs, sixty-two programs for instruction and administration; twenty-four programs available to individuals for professional training and student assistance; and the Office of Education's sixteen research programs. For each program, it identifies: type of assistance; authorization; purpose; amount of appropriation; who may apply; and where to apply. It is a must for every educational researcher.

National Science Foundation

The National Science Foundation was established by the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 and given additional authority by the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966.

It is currently headed by W. D. McElaroy, Director, and a 24-member National Science Board. Essentially, the Foundation is charged with the responsibility of supporting scientific research and education projects in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, social (emphasis ours) and engineering sciences--and in interdisciplinary areas comprised of overlapping fields such as oceanography, meteorology, and biochemistry. The mission of the Foundation is discharged through the leadership of five assistant directors; for international programs, education, national and international programs, research and administration. Operating with a budget of 622 million dollars for FY 1972, the Foundation supports numerous programs of scientific support. Among its major activities are: the development and awarding of grants primarily to universities and other non-profit institutions in support of scientific research, the support of national centers where sophisticated scientific facilities (such as reactors and telescopes) are made available for the use of qualified scientists, maintenance of a current register of scientific and technical personnel and a central clearing house for data on the supply and needs for scientific and technical resources, the awarding of graduate fellowships for various scientific areas including the social sciences, programs aimed at providing support for special institutes, projects to modernize instructional materials; and projects to afford opportunities for high-ability secondary schooling college students to secure scientific experiences.

Two divisions within the National Science Foundation provide support for the kinds of research projects frequently developed within the field of speech communication; the Division of Social Sciences; and the Office of Interdisciplinary Research.

Division of Social Sciences

The Division of Social Sciences, under Associate Director Howard H. Heinz, offers support for general and specific research projects in the areas of anthropology, economic and social geography, economics, history and philosophy of science, linguistics, political science, social psychology, and sociology. While the Division does not list speech communication as a

separate scientific discipline, a perusal of the kinds of "linguistic" and "social psychology" projects funded by the Division suggests that proposals from qualified speech communication scientists are welcome. At this writing, for instance, the Division is currently funding, among other equally relevant projects, a "Conference on Developmental Psycholinguistics" sponsored by the State University of New York School of Social Science; a study of "Non-verbal Effect Communication Processes," (to examine the relationship between autonomic indicators of effective arousal; non-verbal and coding processes as they relate to the intensity dimension of the effective state; and socialization differences in regard to the non-verbal and coding of affect related non-verbal behavior) proposed by Dr. R. Kleck of Dartmouth College; and a Yale University study of "Correlates of Persuasibility and Social Perception" under the direction of Dr. W. J. McGuire of Yale's Department of Psychology.

Proposals may be submitted to the Division of Social Sciences at any time by colleges and universities and by academically related non-profit research organizations. Three to six months are usually required for consideration of a proposal. Grants normally provide support for periods up to twenty-four months, but the duration can be extended under certain circumstances. Institutions are required to share in the cost of each research project supported by an NSF grant. Cost sharing criteria and other specific directions are found in the NSF pamphlet Grants for Scientific Research. This document should be consulted before making applications since the Foundation does not provide standard application forms for research proposals. The pamphlet and additional information may be obtained from the Division of Social Sciences, National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C. 20550.

Interdisciplinary Research Relevant to the Problems of our Society (IRRPOS)

The program of Interdisciplinary Research Relevant to the Problems of our Society was established to implement and stimulate fundamental scientific research that will contribute to the resolution of major national problems. It is based on the premise that the nation needs special efforts to encourage the formation of interdisciplinary research teams that will study specific problems and provide data that may lead to their resolution. Hence, IRRPOS aims at combining the efforts of physical, biological, engineering, and social scientists and enlsiting contributions from non-scientists and other experienced practitioners and professional personnel in nationally vital need-oriented research.

In this regard, the Foundation has even expressed an interest in receiving grant applications from artists and artists groups who wish to "apply" their art to the solution of social problems.

The IRRPOS program has already funded several major interdisciplinary projects relevant to some speech communication researchers. One of them was a project in the area of "Communication and Public Education" to develop educational activities and materials for increasing the scope and depth of public awareness concerning environmental quality. Another program was labeled "Programmatic Perception and Planning." The project was aimed at formulating future environmental related research, information systems, communication and public education programs, and systems analysis projects in order to achieve the capability to project the costs and consequences of alternate policies of action and to develop sets of environmental quality indices. To be sure, neither of these programs are speech communication programs, but they suggest areas in which speech communication scholars may provide helpful input to the kinds of interdisciplinary projects being sponsored under this NSF program.

Before submitting a detailed proposal to the IRRPOS program, the prospective grantee is asked to consider his particular capabilities in relation to the resolution of problems of national concern. He should then discuss an outline of his specific problem and research plan with a member of the staff of the Office of Interdisciplinary Research, or at least submit a descriptive letter to the staff in order that the Foundation can initially assess its suitability for further, formal consideration. Key factors which determine the decision of eligibility are the potential societal impact of the anticipated research and its dependence on an interdisciplinary approach. Another important factor in determining suitability is institutional committment.

Both research project grants and exploratory and planning grants will be considered in this program.

A brochure entitled "Interdisciplinary Research Relevant to the Problems of our Society" and additional information are available from the Office of Interdisciplinary Research, National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C. 20550.

Science Education Support

The National Science Foundation sponsors a wide variety of additional programs in science education that may be of interest to behaviorally-oriented speech communication researchers. Among them are projects designed to further the training of highly able graduate students and established scientists; improve the subject matter competence of teachers of science; provide modern instruc-

tional materials and courses; and improve science instruction at the undergraduate level by assisting institutions in acquiring modern instructional scientific equipment. These programs are administered through one of three science education divisions: Graduate Education and Science, Undergraduate Education and Science, and Pre-college Education and Science. Information about specific programs may be obtained from the Assistant Director for Education, National Science Foundation, Washington, D. C. 20550.

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities was created as an independent agency by the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965. It consists of a National Endowment for the Arts, under Chairman Nancy Hanks, and a National Endowment for the Humanities, under Acting Chairman Wallace B. Edgerton. Each Endowment has its own Council, composed of the Endowment Chairman and 26 other members, which advises the Chairman with respect to policies and procedures and reviews applications for financial support. The activities of the two Endowments are coordinated and related to other Federal programs by the nine-member Federal Council on the Arts and Humanities consisting of the two Endowment Chairmen, the United States Commissioner of Education, the Secretary of the Smithstonian Institution, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Librarian of Congress, the Director of the National Gallery of Art, the Chairman of the Commission on Fine Arts, the Archivist of the United States and a member designated by the Secretary of State.

From a modest appropriation of $5 million in 1966, the financial picture of the Foundation has improved dramatically. The current Federal appropriation to the Foundation is $57,750,000. Of this, 29.7 million goes to the Arts Endowment; $5.5 million for distribution to state programs, $3.5 million for matching private gifts, $3.5 million for administration, and the rest for grants programs. The remaining 28 million goes to the Humanities Endowment; $3.5 million for matching private gifts, $3.5 million for administration, and the rest for grants programs. The response of Congress to the Foundation's programs has been encouraging. This is reflected, financially, in the fact that the Foundation has been authorized $80 million for FY 1973, and many Washington observers anticipate that the Foundation will receive the full appropriation.

National Endowment for the Arts

The domain of the National Endowment for the Arts includes, but is not limited to, music (instrumental and vocal), dance, drama, folk art, creative writing, architecture and allied fields, painting, sculpture, photography, graphic and craft arts, industrial design, costume and fashion design, motion pictures, television, radio, tape and sound recording, the arts related at the presentation, performance, execution, and exhibition of such major art forms, and the study and application of the arts to the human environment.

The bulk of the Art Endowment funds is awarded to: groups or, in appropriate cases, individuals engaged in or concerned with the arts; support productions having substantial artistic and cultural significance; projects that will assist artists and enable them to achieve standards of professional excellence; workshops that will encourage and develop the appreciation and enjoyment of the arts; and two other relevant projects, including surveys, research, and planning in the arts. More limited funds are devoted to grants-in-aid to assist State arts agencies in the development of projects meeting standards of excellence. The Arts Endowment has also sponsored studies which result in recommendations with a view to formulating methods and ways by which creative activities, high standards, and increased opportunities in the arts may be encouraged, and the greater public appreciation and enjoyment of the arts may be developed.

Art Endowment funds are distributed through three major programs: the National Program, the Federal-State Partnership Program, and the Treasury Fund. Approximately 60% of the Endowment's funds are expended by the National Program as direct grants to artists and arts organizations throughout the country. Funds from the Federal-State Partnership Program are divided evenly among the States for use by State arts councils. The Treasury Fund, more limited in scope, matches private donations for Endowment programs dollar for dollar.

Additional information related to the support of speech communication research projects is available from the Office of Research, National Endowment for the Arts, 806 15th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506. The current Annual Report of the Arts Endowment, a brochure on "Summary Highlights, Fiscal 1971 Programs," and a brochure entitled "Economic Aspects of the Performing Arts; a Portrait in Figures," are also available free of charge from the Endowment.

National Endowment for the Humanities

The domain of the National Endowment for the Humanities includes, but is not limited to, the study of: language, both modern and classical; linguistics; literature; history; jurisprudence; philosophy; archaelogy; the history, criticism, theory and practice of the arts; those aspects of the social sciences which have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods; and the study and application of the humanities to the human environment. The Endowment does not list the field of speech communication as a separate academic discipline, but is has clearly expressed an interest in supporting broadly-defined rhetorical studies and other kinds of studies of interest to speech communication teachers and scholars. Unofficially, a Humanities Endowment official has assured us of the agencies' interest in the field of speech communication and has encouraged us to submit research and development proposals. The proof of this interest is reflected in the fact that the Endowment generously supported the most recent SCA developmental project, the "National Developmental Project on Rhetoric" (Project number H 69-0-123), that resulted in the recent publication of The Prospect of Rhetoric (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1971), edited by Lloyd F. Bitzer and Edwin F. Black.

Funding programs of the Humanities Endowment are categorized and administered through the Endowment's four divisions: Education Programs, Public Programs, Research and Publication, and Fellowships and Stipends. Applications may come from individuals--with or without academic affiliations--and from any non-profit institution or organization engaged in humanistic endeavor. Because of limited funds, the Endowment cannot give consideration to requests or support for: pre-doctoral fellowships, construction or restoration costs, museum or library acquisitions, editorial costs of journals or production costs of any publication, costs of permanant equipment, support for research undertaken in pursuit of any academic degree, or individual requests for travel to professional meetings. Beyond this, however, the Endowment supports a wide range of research and development projects in the Humanities.

Education Grants

The Division of Education Programs, headed by Dr. Herbert McArthur, provides outright grants and matches donations from other sources in support of particular educational projects as well as for general purposes. The Division places special, though not exclusive, emphasis on projects that relate the humanities to contemporary issues and problems of national concern.

Two funding programs are currently administered by the Education Division: Project Grants and Planning and Development Grants. Through the Project Grants program, institutions and organizations may apply for support for proposals of clearly defined scope and carefully stated purpose which aim at: carrying out experiments in education in the humanities; holding conferences or institutes to improve teaching in the humanities; developing teaching materials; promoting educational use of libraries; and planning, carrying out, and evaluating curriculum revision. Cost-sharing is generally required for project grants and must be more than token. Applying institutions must be prepared to assume at least 10% of the cost of the project. Project grants usually average about $30,000. The SCA's recent "National Development Project on Rhetoric" is an example of the kinds of project grants typically funded through this program although the amount of this particular grant, $55,670, was well above the average.

The Planning and Development Grants Program provides funds to institutions which have completed a thorough analysis and appraisal of their strengths and weaknesses in the humanities and have identified areas in which, with effective planning, substantial progress can be made. The Endowment is particularly selective in awarding grants for planning and development. For such grants, the Endowment assumes no more than 80% of projected costs during one year, and less than that in succeeding years. Planning grants ordinarily do not exceed $30,000. Developmental grants average between $100,000 and $200,000 a year for three to five years. It is probable that only 12 planning and 12 developmental grants will be available during FY 1972.

All inquiries and applications relating to Project Grants and Planning and Development Grants should be addressed to: Director of Educational Programs, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D. C. 20506.

Public Programs

The Division of Public Programs, under Dr. Richard Harrich, provides funds to develop educational resources in the humanities through its: National Dissemination Program, State and Community Program, and Special Public Program.

The objective of the National Dissemination Program is to develop educational resources in the humanities of a quality suitable for wide dissemination throughout the country by means of public television, films, exhibitions and other media. Programs and presentations qualifying for Endowment support in this area should be for informational educational purposes or general public audiences. Proposed productions should employ the contributions

of first-rate scholars together with equally capable writers, directors, actors and other performers. A subject of special interest to the National Dissemination Program is American History and, as the Bicentennial Celebration approaches, the American Revolution.

Applicants proposing the development of a production or presentation of appreciable length, scope and cost are encouraged to submit, as a first step, a request for a developmental grant from the Endowment. Such a grant might be made, for example, to help finance the research and writing required to produce well developed shooting scripts for film projects. The scripts could then be used as the basis for applying for the funding of production costs.

The Endowment,through its state and community programs, is also prepared to fund projects and programs by organizations or institutions--or by groups of institutions--to provide public education in the humanities in particular communities and regions. Such programs should generally be designed to bring humanistic knowledge to bear on aspects of contemporary national life. Evidence of community support for a proposed program should be provided by the applicant, together with an indication of the extent at which the program might serve as a model for other communities. In all instances, a proposed program should be based upon and addressed to a specific community or group of communities.

Additional information and applications for the National Dissemination Program, and the State and Community Program is available from the Director of Public Dissemination Programs, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D. C. 20506.

Research Grants

The Division of Research Grants, directed by Dr. William Emerson, entertains applications for the support of original thought projects, basic research in the humanities and in those aspects of the social sciences that have humanistic content and employ humanistic methods, and for certain editing projects. The Division is especially interested in projects that bear on major issues of contemporary public concern, and, for the moment, in projects that may contribute to the forthcoming American Revolution Bicentennial Celebration. Most research grants fall into the "small grant" category, not exceeding $15,000 each, but a number of "major grants" ranging up to $50,000 or more, are given for large-scale projects (research grants have been as large as $300,000). Applicants for grants larger than $15,000 should make preliminary inquiry by writing to the Director, Division of Research Grants. Support may be requested for not more than 27

months; for grants under $15,000, project duration should not ordinarily be more than 15 months. Budget requests may include travel and per diem, research and clerical assistance, supplies, cost of materials and equipment, summer support, and up to 2/3 of sabbatic, academic or other leave pay offered by an applicant's institution. Salary payments for release time are not provided. A person applying through an institution must have his project authorized by an officer of that institution and must be able to show, as an integral part of his budget, that the institution is supporting the project in more than nominal fashion--usually by assuming not less than 10% of the total cost of the project. Such cost-sharing is an absolute condition of research grants to persons affiliated with institutions.

Preliminary inquiries, requests for application forms, and instructions and applications for grants should be addressed to: Director of Research Grants, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D. C. 20506.

Research Fellowships and Stipends

The Endowment offers fellowship and stipend awards to help humanists develop their abilities as teachers, scholars, and interpreters of the humanities, through the Division of Fellowships and Stipends. Dr. James H. Blessing is its current director. The following programs are currenently offered: Fellowship for Younger Humanist, to give younger humanists, particularly teachers in the 4-year colleges and universities, free time at a relatively early point in their careers to develop their abilities as teachers and contributors to learning in the humanities (250 fellowships will be available for tenure in the academic year 1972-1973); Summer Stipends for Younger Humanists, to provide approximately 150 summer stipends of $2000 for two continuous months of full-time study (an applicant for a summer stipend must, as in the past, be nominated by the president, dean, or other designated officer of the institution employing him); Senior Fellowships, for persons who have considerable experience as scholars, teachers, writers, or interpreters of the humanities, and have produced significant work (approximately 80 available for 1972-1973); Fellowships for Guided Study in Selected Fields, for young scholars and teachers who have just completed their professional training and seek an opportunity to undertake advanced study in selected fields (current fellowships are for work in Afro-American, American Indian, and Mexican-American studies); Fellowships for Junior College Teachers, to enable junior college teachers to undertake studies that will increase their understanding of the subjects they teach and improve their teaching

(100 fellowships will be available for tenure in the academic year 1972-1973); and Summer Seminars for College Teachers, to provide opportunities to teachers in small private state colleges and junior community colleges to study under distinguished professors at major universities in their regions during the summer of 1972 (offering a stipend of approximately $2000 for applicants who have been teaching for several years in small colleges or in junior or community colleges and who have not had a recent opportunity to extend study at a major university).

Additional information about all of these programs is available from the Division of Fellowships and Stipends, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D. C. 20506. Most application deadlines are in the Fall of 1971. It is anticipated, however, that most of the major programs announced will be continued for the following fiscal year.

A "Program Announcement 1971-1972," and the National Endowment for the Humanities Fifth Annual Report are available from the Endowment.

SECURING A FEDERAL GRANT FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

In the remaining pages, we would like to offer some random comments on the subject of securing Federal funding for your research and development proposal. We will not deal with the subject of how to write a research proposal. Numerous documents are available from a wide variety of sources that offer succinct advice on this subject. Several of them are listed in the bibliography. Instead, we will deal with more general matters of strategy and approach that may be useful to the speech communication researcher.

Need-oriented Research

In spite of the fact that funds appropriated for educational research and development have increased steadily during recent years, able administrators of Federal research and development funds are no longer moved by appeals to "help my discipline," "my institution," or "my department." Faced with the pressing societal problems catalogued daily in the pages of every newspaper, Federal research and development programs are unabashadly priority-oriented. Sometimes those priorities are only loosely identified by phrases such as "current national needs;" sometimes they are specifically enumerated, as in the case of the Office of Education's targeted communication project aimed at the priority areas of: the disadvantaged, career education, education for the handicapped, racial integration, early childhood, reading, and innovation. The point is, you increase your chances of receiving Federal support for your research project if it is aimed, in some way, at helping the nation resolve pressing needs or clearly addressed to the priorities of the program to which you are applying.

To be sure, the Federal government has steadily increased its support for "basic" research, but most Federal funding programs insist that even basic research proposals reflect a priority and national impact-orientation. Even "small grant" applicants are asked to support the contention that their proposed project will have national impact and practical effect. In a word, the name of the funding game in these troubled times is need-oriented research.

Audience Analysis

Another key to success in securing a Federal grant is to be certain that your proposal is presented to the right audience, or program, and carefully adapted to meet the specifications of that program. Acquaint yourself generally with the structure of the Federal government and the specific agencies through which it functions. The most helpful tool for this purpose is probably the United States Government Organization Manual, revised and issued annually on July 1st. (Superintendant of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402. Price: $3.00). This document provides an updated (though inevitably outdated) identification of federal departments and agencies, their mission, legislative authorization, and key administrators, along with organization charts, indexes, bibliographies and other helpful information. It does not, however, provide information about specific agency programs. When you have identified the agency whose mission encompasses your research or developmental proposal, the next step is to write to that agency requesting information about appropriate programs and personnel. An updated (though inevitably outdated) organization chart as well as specific information about the support programs, if any, to which you might appropriately apply should be available from the agency upon request.

Pre-submission Negotiation

When you have received all of the standard literature from the agency to which you are about to apply, it is probable that certain questions will remain to be answered; questions about the appropriateness or your proposal, matters of form and format, and procedures to be utilized in specifying such budget technicalities as cost sharing. At this point, it is frequently advisable to engage in direct negotiations with appropriate agency personnel before formalizing and submitting your proposal. The larger the amount of funds you anticipate requesting, and the more complex your proposal, the greater the advisability of pre-submission negotiation.

It is important to remember that Federal personnel administering research and development programs are charged by law with the responsibility of providing you with adequate information about the specifications and procedures to be utilized in submitting your proposal. They cannot and will not predict that your proposal will be funded, but if you provide them with a precis of the proposal or, in the case of larger projects, a

draft of the proposal, they can and will identify strengths and weaknesses and obvious technical flaws. In short, they can give you feedback that will enable you to maximize the likelihood that your proposal will be funded. A letter with a precis or draft proposal enclosed followed by a phone call to an appropriate official represents an investment of your time and resources that will almost certainly pay you big dividends.

Careful Attention to Specifications

When you submit a research proposal to a Federal agency, you are essentially attempting to persuade a review panel (usually composed of non-Federal scholars) that your proposal is more desirable than a substantial number of others competing for the same research and development funds. We suspect the speech communication scholar would be the last to underestimate the importance of communicator (proposer) credibility in this process. Its importance cannot be overstated. Be sure to read and reread specifications that apply to the support program to which you are applying. Give careful attention to matters of form and format, budget specifications and other "suggestions" disseminated by the agency. When writing the proposal, avoid unnecessary verbage and jargon, state your case clearly, succinctly, and persuasively, and remember that review panels usually see through those semantic "dressings" and "disguises" you are tempted to blend in.

Utilization of Feedback

Several of the Federal officials with whom we have communicated recently tell us that they feel most comfortable when the rate of rejections as oppossed to acceptances is about three to one. That is, the agencies like to receive a sufficient number of proposals so that they can accept and fund the top 30-40%. Of course, the acceptance-rejection ratio varies within agencies and programs, but the fact of life is that many good proposals are turned down simply because the competition, in the judgement of the review panel, was "better." This leaves you with three alternatives: you may abandon your project, you may revise the proposal and, in most cases, resubmit it to the agency that rejected it initially, or you may seek funds elsewhere within the Federal government or in the private sector. In any case, you may profit from the rejection of your proposal if you follow it up by soliciting a rationale for the rejection.

Except for highly classified security material, all Federal funding agencies by law (Public Law 90-23) must be free with information and advice (whether through personal contact, telephone, or correspondence) on matters related to writing a proposal and also on the matter of why a given proposal was rejected. Most agencies are happy to provide you with specific feedback on your proposal simply because it's good public relations; they value your respect and your support.

When you attempt to assess the feedback from a review panel, remember that the panel's comments will usually be stated diplomatically. It is wise to read between the lines. If your unsolicited proposal was rejected by a general purpose program, the agency's representative cannot tell you not to resubmit. Characteristically, he will, in most cases, upon rejecting your proposal, assure you that the door to his agency is still open and that you are welcome to resubmit. When he does, analyze the review panel's reaction to your proposal. It may suggest that a resubmission will lead to success with only minor revision, but it may also discourage you diplomatically from wasting your efforts resubmitting the proposal. The important point is to remember that you have a right to a rationale for rejection. Seeking it will hardly diminish your rejection pains, but it will enable you to profit from the rejection experience.

Other Federal Programs

We would conclude by emphasizing the point that the material included in this brochure relates to only a small percentage of Federal funds allocated to educational research and development. In addition to general, unsolicited research programs, the Federal government supports various educational research and developmental endeavors in nearly every one of its agencies or departments, directly or indirectly. Since effective communication is directly related to the efficiency and ultimate success of every task-oriented organization, including every agency of the government, it is fair to consider all Federal agencies potentially interested in certain kinds of speech communication research and development.

Time spent getting to know the Federal agencies and the programs they sponsor may pay you rich dividends. A case in point is the recent grant to Dr. Richard Huseman, Department of Speech, University of Georgia. Dr. Huseman perceived a need for extensive communication training and analysis within the law enforcement community of Georgia. He submitted a proposal outline, based on previous experiences, to the Law Enforcement

Administration of the Department of Justice and aroused sufficient interest in that agency to win their invitation to submit a formal proposal. The result, an award to Dr. Huseman to study law enforcement communication in situations of conflict.

Appendix A

U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION REGIONAL RESEARCH PROGRAM

	Region	Regional Office
I.	Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont	John Fitzgerald Kennedy Federal Bldg. Boston, Massachusetts 02203 (617) 223-7246
II.	New Jersey, New York, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands	26 Federal Plaza, Room 1013 New York, New York 10007 (212) 264-4423
III.	Delaware, District of Columbia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia	401 North Broad Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19108 (215) 597-7726
IV.	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee	50 Seventh Street, NE, Room 404 Atlanta, Georgia 30323 (404) 526-3821
V.	Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin	226 West Jackson Blvd. Chicago, Illinois 60607 (312) 353-5147
VI.	Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas	1114 Commerce Street Dallas, Texas 75202 (214) 749-2634
VII.	Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska	601 East Twelfth Street Kansas City, Missouri 64106 (816) 374-2528
VIII.	Colorado, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming	19th & Stout Streets, Room 9017 Denver, Colorado 80202 (303) 297-3544

Region	Regional Office
IX. Arizona, California, Hawaii, Nevada, American Samoa, Wake Island, Guam, Trust Territory in the Marianas	50 Fulton Street San Francisco, California 94102 (415) 556-2135
X. Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, Washington	Arcade Plaza Building 1319 Second Avenue Seattle, Washington 98101 (206) 583-0402

Appendix B

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Fiscal Year 1972 Budget

Appropriation Account	Fiscal Year 1971 Appropriation	Fiscal Year 1972 Appropriation
Elementary and Secondary Education.	$1,915,968,000	$1,993,278,000
School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas.	550,675,000	612,620,000
Emergency School Assistance. . . .	74,053,000	---
Education for the Handicapped. . .	105,000,000	115,750,000
Vocational and Adult Education. .	501,357,455	576,108,455
Higher Education.	970,403,000	1,344,384,000
Education Professions Development.	135,000,000	135,000,000
Libraries and Educational Communications.	73,001,500	85,109,000
Research and Development.	93,077,000	113,538,000
Educational Activities Overseas (Special Foreign Currency Program).	3,000,000	3,000,000
Salaries and Expenses.	45,982,000	51,200,000
Civil Rights Education.	19,218,000	---
Student Loan Insurance Fund. . .	10,000,000	---

Appropriation Account	Fiscal Year 1971 Appropriation	Fiscal Year 1972 Appropriation
Higher Education Facilities Loan Fund.	4,685,000	4,610,000
Total, Office of Education. .	4,516,019,955	5,035,477,455
Less: Permanent appropriations and Civil Rights Education.	-30,712,455	-11,410,455
Total, Labor-HEW Appropriations Committee.	4,485,307,500	5,024,067,000

NOTE: Table excludes supplemental appropriation requests proposed for later transmittal, pending enactment of authorizing legislation, for Emergency School Assistance, National Foundation for Higher Education, and National Institute of Education.

Appendix C

GUIDE TO OE-ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS, FISCAL YEAR 1972
GROUP IV: FOR RESEARCH

I. Educational Research (Basic, applied, and regional research):
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: To expand knowledge about teaching and learning and improve educational practice
Appropriation: 7,000,000
Who May Apply: Colleges, universities, education agencies, private or public groups, or individuals
Where to Apply: National Center for Educational Research and Development

II. Educational Research (Development Activities)
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: To develop educational alternatives which will resolve major problems in education
Appropriation: 9,000,000
Who May Apply: (Same as I)
Where to Apply: OE's National Center for Educational Research and Development

III. Dissemination
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: Provide for dissemination of educational information and improved practices to the educational community
Appropriation: 7,600,000
Who May Apply: (Same as I)
Where to Apply: OE's National Center for Educational Communication

IV. Experimental Schools
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: Study feasibility of major educational reforms in total setting
Appropriation: 15,000,000
Who May Apply: (Same as I)
Where to Apply: OE's Experimental Schools Program

V. Anacostia School Community Project
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: (Same as IV)

Appropriation: 2,250,000
Who May Apply: (Same as I)
Where to Apply: OE's Experimental Schools Program

VI. Nutrition and Health
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: Pilot studies coordinating health services and education
Appropriation: 2,000,000
Who May Apply: Local education agencies
Where to Apply: OE's Office of Nutrition and Health

VII. Foreign Language and Area Research
Authorization: National Defense Education Act
Purpose: Support research on improved instruction and materials development in modern foreign languages and area studies
Appropriation: 1,000,000
Who May Apply: Colleges and universities, public school systems, professional organizations, individuals
Where to Apply: OE's Institute of International Studies

VIII. Libraries and Educational Technology
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: Library and information science research and demonstration
Appropriation: 2,750,000
Who May Apply: Colleges, universities, school districts, State governments, other nonprofit groups.
Where to Apply: OE's Bureau of Libraries and Educational Technology

IX. Institutional Support
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: Conduct research on the major areas of continuous concern in education and develop and test educational innovations until ready for classroom use
Appropriation: 33,000,000
Who May Apply: Colleges, universities, agencies, and organizations

X. Vocational Education Research
Authorization: Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended
Purpose: Improve vocational education
Appropriation: 9,000,000

Who May Apply: Education agencies and private institutions and organizations
Where to Apply: OE's National Center for Educational Research and Development

XI. Vocational Research (Special Projects)
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: Improve educational preparation for careers
Appropriation: 18,000,000
Who May Apply: Education agencies, public and private institutions and organizations, and individuals
Where to Apply: OE's National Center for Educational Research and Development

XII. Handicapped Research and Demonstration
Authorization: Education of the Handicapped Act - title VI-E
Purpose: Promote research and demonstration on education of the handicapped
Appropriation: 15,455,000
Who May Apply: State education agencies, local school districts, nonprofit private organizations, public groups
Where to Apply: OE's Bureau of Education for Handicapped, Division of Research

XIII. Social Programs for Children With Specific Learning Disabilities
Authorization: Education of the Handicapped Act - **title VI-6**
Purpose: Develop model centers for the improvement of education of children with specific learning **disabilities**
Appropriation: 2,250,000
Who May Apply: State education agencies, colleges, universities, and other appropriate nonprofit agencies
Where to Apply: OE's Bureau of Education for Handicapped, Division of Research

XIV. Overseas Research in Language and Area Studies in Non-Western Areas
Authorization: Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act and P.L. 83-480
Purpose: Promote development of international studies through grants to institutions for support of group or individual (faculty and PH.D dissertation) research
Appropriation: 3,190,000 1,000,000
Who May Apply: Colleges, universities, consortiums, local and State education agencies, nonprofit educational organizations

Where to Apply: Participating institutions (information from OE's Institute of International Studies)

XV. Physical Education and Recreation for the Handicapped
Authorization: Education of the Handicapped Act - title VI-E
Purpose: To do research in areas of physical education and recreation for handicapped children
Appropriation: 300,000
Who May Apply: State or local education agencies, public or nonprofit private educational or research agencies and organizations
Where to Apply: OE's Bureau of Education for Handicapped, Division of Research

XVI. Career Education Community Project
Authorization: Cooperative Research Act
Purpose: Demonstrate career education
Appropriation: 2,000,000
Who May Apply: Colleges, universities, agencies, institutions
Where to Apply: OE's National Center for Educational Research and Development

Appendix D

SELECTED GUIDE TO AGENCIES AND PERSONNEL

Office of Education
(400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202, (202) 963-1110)

Commissioner of Education . . . . . Sidney P. Marland, Jr.
Executive Deputy Commissioner . . . . . Peter P. Muirhead
Deputy Commissioner for Management . . . . . John R. Ottina, Acting
Deputy Commissioner for External Relations . . . . . Charles Saunders, Acting
Deputy Commissioner for Development . . . . . Don Davies, Acting
  Associate Commissioner, National Center for Educational Research and Development . . . . . Robert McVity
  Director, Division of Elementary and Secondary Education Research . . . Glenn C. Borreigter
  Director, Division of Comprehensive and Vocational Education Research . . . Robert E. Pruitt, Acting
  Director, Division of Higher Education Research . . . . . Paul Messier, Acting
  Director, Division of Educational Laboratories . . . . . Ernest Mighelsen, Acting
Assistant Commissioner, National Center for Educational Communication . . Lee G. Burchinal
Associate Commissioner, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development . . . . William L. Smith, Acting
Deputy Commissioner for School Systems . . . Terrel H. Bell
Deputy Commissioner for Higher Education . . . . . Peter P. Muirhead, Acting

National Science Foundation
(1800 G Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20550, (202) 655-4000)

Director . . . . . William D. McElroy
Deputy Assistant Director for Education . . . Keith R. Kelson, Acting
Division Director, Graduate Education in Science . . . . . Howard D. Kramer
Division Director, Pre-College Education in Science . . . . . Charles A. Whitmer

Division Director, Undergraduate Education in Science . . . . . Alfred F. Borg, Acting
Division Director, Science Resources Studies . . . . . Charles E. Falk
Assistant Director for Institutional Programs . . . . . Louis Levin
Assistant Director for National and International Programs . . . . . Thomas B. Owen
Deputy Assistant Director for National and International Programs . . T. O. Jones
Assistant Director for Research . . . . Edward C. Creutz
Deputy Assistant Director for Research . . . . . Edward P. Todd
Division Director, Biological and Medical Sciences . . . . . Harve J. Carlson
Division Director, Engineering . . . . John M. Ide
Division Director, Environmental Sciences . . . . . A. P. Crary
Division Director, Mathematical and Physical Sciences . . . . . William E. Wright
Division Director, Social Sciences . . Howard H. Hines
Assistant Director for Research Applications . . . . . Alfred J. Eggers, Jr.
Deputy Assistant Director for Science and Technology . . . . . Joel A. Snow
Deputy Assistant Director for Program Management . . . . . Leon M. Schwartz
Assistant Director for Administration . .Bernard Sisco

National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities
(806 Fifteenth Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20506, (202) 382-4091)

National Endowment for the Arts:
Chairman . . . . . Nancy Hanks
Deputy Chairman . . . . . Michael Straight
Special Assistant to the Chairman . . . Douglas Richards
Executive Officer . . . . . Charles E. Kirk, Jr.
Director, State and Community Operations . . . . . Clark H. Mitze
Director, Educational Programs . . . . . John H. Kerr
Director, Literary Programs . . . . . Leonard Randolph
Director, Music Programs . . . . . Walter Anderson
Director, Architecture, Planning and Design . . . . . (Vacancy)
Director, Theatre Programs . . . . . Ruth Mayleas
Director, Dance Programs . . . . . June Arey

Director, Visual Arts . . . . . Brian O'Doherty

National Endowment for the Humanities:

Chairman	(Vacancy)
Deputy Chairman	Wallace B. Edgerton
Special Assistant to the Chairman	(Vacancy)
Public Information Officer	Darrel DeChaby
Director, Office of Planning and Analysis	Robert Kingston
Director, Educational Programs	Herbert McArthur
Director, Public Programs	Richard Hedrich
Director, Division of Research and Publications	William R. Emerson
Director, Division of Fellowships and Stipends	James Blessing
Director, State Based Programs	John Barcroft

Director of Administration	Paul P. Berman
Associate General Counsel (Humanities)	Joseph Schurman
Associate General Counsel (Arts)	Lawrence L. Reger
Financial Manager	Joyce E. Freeland
Director, Office of Grants (Humanities)	Kathleen Brady
Director, Office of Grants (Arts)	James R. Thomas
Personnel Officer	David Johnstone

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography is not intended to be comprehensive but rather representative of the kinds of published sources available to the speech communication researcher seeking Federal funds. A sampling of the material reflected in this bibliography is frequently available in the offices of university research administrators. In the case of Federal publications, most are available in the government documents section of your college library.

Bulletins, Newsletters, and Periodicals

A.E.T.A. Theatre News. (9-12 Times Yearly) American Educational Theatre Association, Suite 500, 1317 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004. Available to AETA members.

Covers general theatre news including relevant research reports and important developments in the areas of funding and Federal legislation.

American Education. (10 Times a Year) Office of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20202. Annual subscription: $4.50

Keeps you up-to-date on general Office of Education policies, programs, and personnel along with providing helpful bibliography and, in the fall, a guide to Office of Education programs.

Arts Reporting Service. (Biweekly) 1230 13th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. Annual subscription: $25.00

Reports general news relevant to all of the arts including important meetings and events, analysis of trends, and matters of legislation and finance.

ASHA. (Monthly) American Speech and Hearing Association, 9030 Old Georgetown Road, Washington, D.C. 20014. Annual subscription: $18.00

Includes research reports, professional news for the speech and hearing sciences, and information on government affairs pertinent to the grantsman.

Behavior Today. (Weekly) Communications/Research/Machines, Inc., Del Mar, California 92014. Annual Subscription: $20.00. Subscription Correspondence: Box 2993, Boulder Colorado 80302.

Covers latest developments in the behavioral sciences including legislation, organization activities, major grant programs, and personnel activities.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (Weekly during the academic year) Editorial Projects for Education, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Annual subscription: $20.00

A thorough, well-written higher education newspaper covering the national scene from Capitol Hill to personnel news.

College and University Bulletin. (Semi-monthly) American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. Available to AAHE members. Annual subscription: $10.00

Covers trends in Washington and around the world pertinent to the educator, administrator, and researcher.

Educational Researcher. (Monthly) American Educational Research Association. 1126 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 Annual subscription: $5.00

Covers major educational research programs and personnel.

Education-Training Market Report. (Biweekly) E.F. Shelley and Company, Inc., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Annual subscription: $48.00

Reports Washington education news including the status of relevant legislation, news funding programs, national trends, and education VIP activities.

Education U.S.A. (Weekly except summer) National School Public Relations Association, 1201 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Annual subscription: $21.00

Succinct report of major general education news, brief analysis, and annotation of pertinent media-disseminated materials.

Federal Notes. (Twice monthly). Office of Federal Relations, Extension Hall Annex, University Campus, Corvallis, Oregon 97331. Annual subscription: $17.00

A capsulized summary of events affecting sources of funds for education with a focus on Federal legislation and grant programs.

Higher Education and National Affairs. (App. 40 times a year) American Council of Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. Annual subscription: $25.00

The latest data on important legislation, programs, finances and personnel--clear, succinct, accurate.

Humanities. (Quarterly) National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, D.C. 20506

Promotes the Endowment's programs. Includes pertinent deadline dates.

Mosaic. (Quarterly) National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550. Annual subscription: $12.50

Covers National Science Foundation programs, policies, and personnel.

NEAB Newsletter. (Biweekly) National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Available to NEAB members. New members annual subscription: $10.00

Covers legislative and funding matters pertinent to educational broadcasters.

Report. (Biweekly) Capital Publications, Inc., Suite G-12, 2430 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037. Annual subscription: $40.00

Reports on matters relevant to basic and applied researchers in education.

Science and Government Report. (Twice monthly) P.O. Box 21123, Washington, D.C. 20009. Annual subscription: $25.00

News and analysis on science policy affairs in Washington. A little off the mark for most speech communication people.

Spectra. (Bimonthly) Speech Communication Association, Statler Hilton Hotel, New York, N. Y. 10001. Available to SCA members. Non-member annual subscription: $2.50

Covers items of interest to speech communication professionals including grant information. "Research Notes" column is aimed at helping the speech communication researcher.

Trends. (Monthly, September through July) National School Public Relations Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Annual subscription: $8.00

Reports communication and public relations developments. Largely an administrator's tool.

Washington International Arts Letter. (10 Times a year) 115 5th Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003. Annual subscription: $25.00

Covers major legislation, funding trends, personnel news, and some bibliographic material. Usually right on target.

Washington Monitor. (Weekly except summer) National School Public Relations Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Supplement to Education U.S.A.

Two-page report of important developments in legislation, Federal programs and key Federal personnel.

Agency Publications

Office of Education

A New Grant Program in Support of Basic Research in Education.
Printed brochure.

American Education's Annual Guide to OE Programs.
Government Printing Office, #HE 5.211: 11015-72. Price: 20 cents. Also available from the Office of Education.

The Commissioner's Annual Report, March 31, 1971.
Government Printing Office, #HE 5.211:11032. Price: 20 cents.

Cooperative Support for Educational Research and Related Activities.
Mimeographed description of NCERD's programs.

Education Professions Development Act.
Description of programs administered by the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development.

Instructions for Preparing a Proposal, Bureau of Research.
Mimeographed.

Office of Education Support for Research and Related Activities.
Packet. Includes descriptions of NCERD's program, forms and instructions for preparing a proposal, and other information.

The Office of Interdisciplinary Research, A Report on Activities and Programs, August, 1970.
Mimeographed.

PREP: Putting Research into Educational Practice.
Packet of materials growing out of Office of Research projects.

Program Administration Manual for Child Advocacy Demonstration Projects.
Mimeographed packet.

Regional Project Research: Guidelines for Preparing a Proposal, October, 1970.
Printed brochure.

Specifications for Targeted Communications Projects, Fiscal Year 1972.
Mimeographed.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

A Guide for Educational Institutions: Establishing Indirect Cost Rates for Research Grants and Contracts with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Government Printing Office. Price: 35 cents.

A Guide for Non-Profit Institutions: Establishing Indirect Cost Rates for Research Grants and Contracts with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Government Printing Office, #OASC-5. Price: 45 cents.

National Institutes of Health: Grant Programs for Training and Education, September, 1970.
Mimeographed.

National Science Foundation

Interdisciplinary Research Relevant to the Problems of Our Society, April, 1970.
Mimeographed.

Knowledge Into Action: Improving the Nation's Use of the Social Sciences.
Report of the Special Commission on the Social Sciences of the National Science Board. Government Printing Office. Price: 75 cents.

National Science Foundation Annual Report.
Printed brochure.

National Science Foundation: Grants for Scientific Research.
Printed brochure.

National Science Foundation: Guide to Programs, June, 1970.
Government Printing Office, NSF 70-14. Price: 75 cents.

National Science Foundation: Research Applied to National Needs, Fiscal Years 1970-1972.
Mimeographed.

National Endowment for the Humanities

National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Education Programs, Guidelines for Planning and Development Grants Proposals.
Mimeographed.

National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Research and Publication, General Information and Application Instructions.
Mimeographed.

National Endowment for the Humanities Fifth Annual Report.
Government Printing Office. Price: 50 cents.

National Endowment for the Humanities: Program Announcement 1971-1972.
Printed brochure.

National Endowment for the Arts

Economic Aspects of the Performing Arts: A Portrait in Figures Government Printing Office. 0--423--191. Price: 30 cents.

National Council on the Arts, National Endowment for the Arts, The First Five Years: Fiscal 1966 through 1970. Printed brochure.

National Endowment for the Arts Annual Report. Government Printing Office. Price: $1.00. Printed brochure.

Summary Highlights, Fiscal 1971 Programs, National Endowment for the Arts. Mimeographed.

Miscellaneous

AASCU Guide to Proposal Writing. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1971. Brief printed brochure.

Buchtel, Foster S., A Basic Guide for the Preparation and Submission of Proposals for Research Support. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1970. A thirty-six page printed brochure available from the Campus Bookstore, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001. Price: $1.50

Educational Research and Development in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970. Catalog No. HE5.212:12049. Price: $2.00

Hall, Mary Jo, and Frank, Robert E., 241 Sources of Information on Funds An Annotated Bibliography. Corvallis, Oregon: DCE Publications, University of Oregon, 1969.

Krathwohl, David, R., How to Prepare a Research Proposal. Fifty page brochure available from the Speech Communication Association. Price: $1.00

Strickland, Stephen, ed., Sponsored Research in American Universities and Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1967.

United States Government Organization Manual 1971/1972. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971. Stock Number 2203-0087. Price: $3.00

Wolk, Ronald A., ed., Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education. Berkeley, California: Carnegie Commission, 1968.

PART II

SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR SPEECH COMMUNICATION RESEARCH: THE PRIVATE SECTOR

BY

PATRICK C. KENNICOTT
ASSOCIATE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY FOR RESEARCH

SPEECH COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION
STATLER HILTON HOTEL
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10001

PREFACE

The material in the following pages is intended to be of maximum utility for the teacher and researcher in the field of speech communication. The utility criterion had a substantial effect on the form and substance of the document. It was mimeographed, not printed, to allow last minute changes in the manuscript and to hasten the publication process. Names of foundation administrators, addresses, and current financial statistics, when available, were included for their immediate usefulness in full recognition of the fact that inclusion of such information would date the document shortly after its publication.

Our intention is to publish a new edition of this document frequently as an update of the latest information concerning the financing of educational research and development within the private sector of the American economy. We hope to make each new edition of the document more complete, accurate, and useful to the speech communication researcher. So we welcome your reaction to the information that follows, your suggestions and admonitions.

A word of sincere appreciation is due to two individuals who participated in the development of this document but who are in no way responsible for its weaknesses. William Work, Executive Secretary of the Speech Communication Association, offered helpful comments and encouragement. And particular thanks is due to my able secretary, Miss Sherry Tobak, for her cheerful assistance, perseverance, and substantial contribution.

Patrick C. Kennicott
Associate Executive Secretary
for Research
January 20, 1972

CONTENTS

PREFACE ii

THE FOUNDATION WORLD. 1

Foundations Defined
Foundation History
Foundations Classified
Corporate Philanthropy

REPRESENTATIVE FOUNDATIONS. 9

Axe-Houghton Foundation
Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Inc.
Carnegie Corporation of New York
Danforth Foundation
Esso Education Foundation
Ford Foundation
Johnson Foundation, Inc.
W.K. Kellogg Foundation
Charles F. Kettering Foundation
John and Mary R. Markle Foundation
Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
Rockefeller Foundation
Shell Companies Foundation, Inc.
Whitney Foundation

SECURING A FOUNDATION GRANT 26

Identifying Appropriate Funding Agencies
Initial Explorations
Conclusion

APPENDICES

A. Foundation Center Libraries
B. Grant Categories Reported in Foundation News
C. Processing a Foundation Grant
D. Shortcomings Found in Research Proposals
E. Summary of Grants, 1961-1970

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 43

THE FOUNDATION WORLD

If you were asked to identify the largest source of private philanthropy in the United States, which of the following would it be: businesses, bequests, foundations, or living individuals? To the surprise of many, the last category is the largest--three times larger than the other three combined. Of the estimated $15.8 billion in private philanthropy contributed in the United States in 1968, $12.1 billion (77%) came from living individuals, $1.5 billion (9%) from foundations, $1.3 (8%) from bequests, and the remaining $925 million (6%) from businesses.

In spite of the overwhelming importance of individual voluntary contributions for providing essential support for the nation's colleges and universities, hospitals, museums, symphony orchestras, community theatres and virtually all religious institutions, philanthropic foundations have played an ever-increasing role in the advancement of human welfare, particularly in the areas of education, health, social welfare, and the arts. One source has credited foundations with providing crucial support for the following contributions to the quality of American life: reform of medical education, free public libraries, scholarship programs providing higher education for talented students, control of yellow fever, a pension system for college and university faculties, legal aid and defense of the poor, greater educational and economic opportunity for Negroes, and the use of television as an educational tool, to mention just a few. A similar list of credits has been attributed to the philanthropic programs of private industry.

The field of education currently receives a lion's share of foundation and business philanthropy. The Foundation Directory suggests that during the decade of the sixties "more than half of all foundation dollars went to Education broadly defined."[1] Similarly, business support of education in 1969 was estimated by the Council For Financial Aid To Education at "375 million dollars, compared to 150 million in 1959," a growth rate of approximately 9.6 percent per year, a rate which exceeds the growth of corporate

---

[1] Marianna C. Lewis, ed., The Foundation Directory, Fourth Edition (New York: Columbia University Press, 1971), xvi.

profits and the growth of most of the major indices of economic activity."[2] A simple perusal of the education grants reported in such indices as Foundation News or the Chronicle of Higher Education underscores the importance of private philanthropy to educational research and development.

The material in the following pages is intended to provide the reader with a general view of educational research and development funds available within the private sector. The principle focus will be on foundations, with some attention to sources of revenue within the business community. Our perspective will, furthermore, be restricted to funding programs relevant to the interests of speech communication teachers and researchers.

Foundations Defined

One of the first noticeable features of foundations is their diversity in size, focus, function, and support of philanthropic causes. Perhaps because of their diversity, accepted definitions of foundations are inevitably quite general. Satiric definitions mirror public attitudes:

> Foundations are a large body of money surrounded by outstretched hands.
>
> A foundation is a pile of money totally beyond the reach of the tax collector--and of anyone else we don't like.
>
> A foundation is proof that even if you can't take it with you, you can keep it away from the federal government.

Foundations are frequently defined critically:

> Foundations are tax dodges, created by the greedy rich to cheat the Internal Revenue Service.
>
> Foundations waste their time and money on impractical, inapplicable research of interest only to a handful of obscure academicians, and they are afraid to come down into the street to wrestle with the meaningful issues of society.

---

[2] Aid-to-Education Programs of Some Leading Business Concerns, Seventh Edition (New York: Council For Financial Aid To Education, 1970), ii.

> Foundations are run by superior beings who know what's good for the country, and should be left alone while they do it for us.
>
> Foundations are manned by unfettered social activists bent upon revamping America through support of radicals and their schemes; they ruthlessly unseat Congressmen and other elective officials, using tax-exempt funds in the process.[3]

For purposes of taxation, foundations are defined in general terms in Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954:

> Corporations, in any community chest, fund or foundation organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting, to influence legislation, which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.[4]

The Foundation Directory simply defines a foundation as a "non-governmental nonprofit organization, with funds and programs managed by its own trustees or directors, and established to maintain or aid social, educational, charitable, religious, or other activities serving the common welfare."[5] This definition includes charitable trusts and certain corporations.

Foundation History

Supporters of the philanthropic foundation attribute to it a long and illustrious history initiated by an extension of primi-

---

[3] Joseph C. Goulden, The Money Givers, (New York: Random House, 1971), 6-7.

[4] Ibid., 8.

[5] Lewis, vii.

tive man's altruistic family sympathy to members of his tribe and community. They claim that systematic programs of support for the needy and the enrichment of community life are traceable to early Hebrew, Greek and Roman culture and have persevered in Western society to the mid-nineteenth century when the modern independent foundation as we know it today began to take form.

The first American philanthropic foundation was the Peabody Education Fund, capitalized with one million dollars by George Peabody for the encouragement of education in the South. The fundamental impetus for the 20th century foundation movement came with the benevolent activities of John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie culminating in the founding of the Carnegie Corporation in 1911 and the Rockefeller Foundation in 1913.

From modest beginnings in the first decade of the twentieth century, the modern American foundation world has grown dramatically in size, scope, and sophistication. Files of the Foundation Library Center currently include information on more than 26,000 active American foundations with assets exceeding 25.2 billion dollars reporting grants in excess of 1,152 million dollars annually.

Foundations Classified

Foundations may be classified according to size--an important variable for the potential applicant. Of the 26,000 active American foundations identified by the Foundation Center in 1970, only 5,454 were considered large enough for inclusion in the most recent Foundation Directory. In order to be included, a Foundation must: make grants of $25,000 or more in the year of record, or possess assets of $500,000 or more. Thus the Directory considers more than 20,000 of America's foundations in the "very small" category and hence not significant enough to justify further comment. For purposes of classification, the remaining American foundations are considered, by the Directory, to fall into the following three categories:[6]

Asset Category	Number of foundations	Number of grants	Total amount of grants	Average grant
$10 million up	331	42,694	$881,854,536	$20,655
$1 - $10 million	1,841	102,156	375,965,070	3,680
Under $1 million	3,282	146,298	255,622,794	1,747

[6] Lewis, 8.

Total	5,454	291,148	$1,513,442,400	$5,198

All of the foundation data to follow will be based on the 5,454 "significant" foundations listed by the Directory.

For general purposes, foundations may be classified in five general categories: general purpose, special purpose, company-sponsored, community and family. Certainly there is overlapping among them, yet their chartered objectives and methods of operation differ enough to render this classification scheme essentially valid.

Most of the major foundations with which we will be concerned may be classified general purpose. There are more than 370 of these active today; among them, the Rockefeller Foundation, Ford Foundation, W.K. Kellogg Foundation, Carnegie Corporation, and the Twentieth Century Fund. Each is chartered for general purposes, governed by trustees of national prominence, administered centrally by a professional staff, and addresses itself to a wide range of basic problems, both national and international. General purpose foundations hold approximately two-thirds of the assets of all foundations and make more than half the total of all grants.

Approximately 500 major foundations as well as a large number of "very small" foundations may be classified special purpose. Many of these were created by a will or trust instrument and each may be identified on the basis of the specific focus of its funding activities. A good example of a smaller, special-purpose foundation is the Axe-Houghton Foundation incorporated in New York in 1965 by Emerson W. Axe "to encourage the improvement of language and all of its manifestations, including remedial speech, public speaking, and speaking as an art form."[7] More will be said about this foundation later. Unfortunately, this is the only foundation we have been able to discover with a special purpose in the area of speech communication.

There are approximately 1500 company-sponsored foundations active today. Among them are the Sears-Roebuck Foundation, United States Steel Foundation, Esso Education Foundation, and the Scripps-Howard Foundation. These are distinguished by their close association with sponsoring companies. The Ford Foundation

[7] Lewis, 249

is not closely associated with the Ford Motor Company but merely named after its founder and is therefore not classified as a company-sponsored foundation, but the Esso Education Fund receives a substantial annual appropriation from its parent company and its activities are closely monitored by the company. Hence, it is company-sponsored. Foundations in this category are often not heavily endowed but rely on annual appropriations from their parent company. Monies appropriated are usually spent in the year appropriated and are called "pass-through" funds. In effect, the company-sponsored foundation functions as the administrative agent of corporate philanthropy.

Community foundations are a small but increasingly important segment of the foundation world. There are currently approximately 200 of them with only three percent of foundation assets, but their number and assets are expected to grow dramatically in the years ahead in response to restrictions placed on very small private foundations by the Tax Reform Act of 1969. Usually associated with local banks, such foundations are directed by community citizens and their funds are frequently designated for specific purposes. The oldest and largest of the community foundations is the Cleveland Foundation.

The final group of foundations, and numerically the largest, is the family type. They are either formed by endowments or annual gifts. Individual donors frequently assume an active interest in the administration of family foundation funds. The great bulk of these foundations function without a professional staff, do not solicit applications for grants, and confine their activities to the immediate charitable interests of their donor patrons. Some of the larger family foundations, however, function very much like the general purpose foundations mentioned earlier. Such foundations as the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Flint Michigan; the Lilly Endowment, Indianapolis, Indiana; and the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, fall into this category.

Corporate Philanthropy

Considering the fact that many corporations channel their philanthropy through company-sponsored foundations, it is clear that corporate giving and foundation funding must be considered together. The American Association of Fund Raising Council tells us that 1960 corporate contributions amounted to 482 million dollars and virtually doubled during the decade of the sixties. At last estimate, nearly forty percent of corporate giving was designated "aid to education." Thus, the Council For Financial Aid To

Education estimates that in 1969, corporations gave a total of 375 million dollars to education, about seventy percent of this in direct and indirect aid to colleges and universities and the remainder for scholarships and other assistance to individuals, support of secondary education, and other miscellaneous educational projects.

There are indeed legitimate potential sources of revenue for speech communication research and development outside of the federal government. Sometimes the best revenue source is the small, "very small," local foundation or business that may stand to benefit tangibly from the results of speech communication research and development or at least from the publicity that will accrue from a particular project. More frequently, however, the potential revenue source is the large major foundation whose interests and record of activities are consistent with the objectives of the researcher.

The material that follows is designed to provide the speech communication researcher with some general information relevant to the pursuit of research funds within the private sector. It is organized in three parts. The first is a section describing a sampling of major foundations whose charters suggest that they may be a potential source of funds for various kinds of speech communication research and development projects. The second offers some general suggestions concerning methods to utilize in identifying appropriate foundations and approaching such foundations with a project proposal. The final section, the bibliography, will point the reader to useful published resources.

Several qualifications concerning the material offered in this document should be noted. First, the information contained in this report has been gleaned from numerous publications, information available to the general public from the files of the Foundation Library Center, annual foundation reports, and several recent interviews with foundation officials. None of it, however, is "official information." It is intended to provide the reader with a general perspective on the solicitation of funds from private foundations. But it should not be inferred that mention of any specific foundation, corporation, or related organization guarantees the reader an entree to foundation funds or even to key foundation personnel.

Secondly, it should be remembered that the world of private philanthropy, responsive to the ever-changing winds of public temperament, public policy, and the status of the American economy, is in a state of constant flux. Generalizations about foundation financing that are true today may be old-hat tomorrow.

Published interests of any given foundation are subject to change, and, in some cases, change frequently. In short, the data reported in the following pages, however accurate it may be at the moment of writing, is not only subject to change, it is likely to change to some degree in the months ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE FOUNDATIONS

It is impossible to predict with any accuracy whether or not a given proposal will be welcomed by any foundation. A number of variables affect foundation receptiveness. Among them are the current availability of resources in the light of prior commitments, market fluctuations, current priorities established by the foundation's management, the biases and predispositions of the foundation's staff, and the volume and quality of proposals under consideration. Nonetheless, certain information, available to the general public, can be discovered about a foundation that will yield intelligent inferences concerning the likelihood that it will be receptive to a given proposal. The most crucial information includes: chartered purpose, size of the foundation, including its assets, income, and current level of spending, current priorities, and recent record of activities.

The following pages contain such data on a sampling of major foundations whose charter and recent activities suggest that they might be interested in funding quality speech communication research and development projects. With the notable exception of the Axe-Houghton Foundation, none of them have, to date, invested significant resources in speech communication research and development, but neither have they excluded speech communication as a field.

It should be noted that the information that follows is available to the general public through several sources. The most important is the Internal Revenue Service. In order to retain its tax-exempt status, every foundation must file an annual financial report with the IRS. The report, recorded on Form 990-A, itemizes: salaries paid to foundation officers, amount of holdings, both at book value and fair market value, excess of income over expenditures (or vice-versa), name and address of grant recipients, the amount paid and the purpose of each grant and other useful information. All portions of Form 990-A except the names of contributors are considered public information and may be inspected at the national IRS office in Washington or at central repositories operated by the Foundation Library Center (see Appendix A).

The Foundation Directory, recently published in its fourth edition, is another important locus of data about active American foundations. It includes an abundant selection of statistical analyses of current and comparative foundation philanthropy, a statement of the activities of 5,454 "significant" American foundations, including information on assets, income, expenditures, priorities and personnel, and an abundance of useful indexes and appendices. The Directory is a judicious sampling of an even larger body of useful

information available to the public through the Foundation Library Center and its regional repositories.*

A third important source of information is the annual reports issued by most major national foundations. The Tax Reform Act of 1969 served to abolish a good deal of the secrecy under which many foundations formerly functioned by requiring foundations to keep an accurate record of their activities and to make that record accessable to the general public. Hence, the fund-seeker will find most major foundations staffed with professionals who are anxious to answer questions, offer advice, and provide annual reports that are attractively printed and usually quite informative.

Finally, the funding activities of active foundations are carefully watched by a host of professional observers and reported through such journals as The Chronicle of Higher Education, Foundation News, and Behavior Today. Several commercial "clearing houses" of "inside information" are also available to professional fund-raisers for a substantial annual price. Some of them are well done and worth a trip to your university's grants office or library reference room.

---

*The information that appears in the following pages was drawn largely, though not exclusively, from the Foundation Directory.

Name: Axe-Houghton Foundation
320 Park Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10022

Incorporation: New York, 1965, with a donation from Emerson W. Axe.

Description: To encourage the improvement of language in all its manifestations, including remedial speech, public speaking, and speaking as an art form.

Financial Data: (year ended 28 February 1970) Assets, $1,266,697; expenditures, $52,912, including $52,500 for 7 grants.

Recent Grants: $10,200 to Hunter College, City University of New York, for development of oral communications through lecture-recitals and other related activities; $14,950 to Hunter College, City University of New York, to expand and develop the area of Oral Interpretation of Literature in the Department of Communications.

Personnel: Howard A. Cutler, President; Cyril F. Hager, Vice-President; William A. Hance, Secretary and Treasurer.

Publications: None.

Name: Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Inc.
102 Raynolda Village
Winston-Salem, N. C. 27106

Incorporation: North Carolina, 1953, with donations from Mary Reynolds Babcock and Charles H. Babcock.

Description: Major support to education, including humanities and the arts; also support for national educational research, welfare and social service, and youth development. No grants to individuals or for building programs and rarely for medical research and public health.

Financial Data: (year ended 31 August 1969) Assets, $32,576,870; expenditures, $1,578,780, including $1,469,947 for 66 grants.

Recent Grants: $10,250 to Martha Stewart Communications, New York, for the production of a video tape for use in a series of programs entitled "Are You Listening?"; $1,000 to the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting, New York, to support a national conference on citizens rights in broadcasting; $20,000 to North Carolina Leadership Institute, Inc., Greensboro, to establish an additional leadership program on one of the North Carolina campuses, preferably black; $10,000 to the Theatre Development Fund, New York, for general support; $5,000 to the Theatre for the Forgotten, Inc., New York, for general support.

Personnel: Katherine Babcock Mount Castle, President; Kenneth F. Mount Castle, Jr., Treasurer; William C. Archie, Executive Director.

Publications: Annual Report.

Name: Carnegie Corporation of New York
437 Madison Avenue
New York, N. Y. 10022

Incorporation: New York, 1911, with a donation from Andrew Carnegie.

Description: The advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the peoples of the United States and of the British Commonwealth, excluding India, Pakistan, and the United Kingdom. Grants are made to colleges, universities, professional associations, and other educational organizations. No grants for buildings, endowment, scholarships, or general support.

Financial Data: (year ended 30 June 1970) Assets, $20,361,269; gifts received, $1,608,720; expenditures, $2,314,354, including $516,657 for 998 pensions and $1,797,697 for program.

Recent Grants: $600,000 to the Children's Television Workshop for continuing support of "Sesame Street"; $94,000 to the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development for developing courses in creative problem-solving at several age levels; $293,000 to the American Association of Junior Colleges for a program to increase the capability of community colleges to serve veterans and servicemen.

Personnel: Thomas Lowe Hughes, President; Lee B. Harris, Vice President for Administration and Secretary; Alfred Brittain, III, Treasurer.

Publications: Annual Report.

Note: Carnegie Corporation recently reported to us "We do not have any current program concerned with speech communication, and we do not expect to expand our interests in that direction in the forseeable future."

Name: Danforth Foundation
222 South Central Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63105

Incorporation: Missouri, 1927, with a donation from Mr. and Mrs. William H. Danforth.

Description: To aid persons to emphasize the humane values of the Hebrew-Christian tradition. . . to strengthen the essential quality of education with special concern for liberal education, the preparation and strengthening of college teachers, and other forms of assistance to college personnel.

Financial Data: (year ended 31 May 1970) Assets, $161,912,257; gifts received, $3,500; expenditures, $10,497,076 including $5,746,413 for 157 grants and $3,925,447 for programs.

Recent Grants: $20,000 to the Navajo Community College, Chinly, Arizona to provide students training and experience in decision-making; $75,000 to the Association of American Colleges to establish an office of general responsibilities related to the status and education of women in higher education; $25,000 to the University of Texas for a revised program in freshman English and an intensive summer language program; $20,000 to Miles College for a special interdisciplinary course in the humanities for sophomores focusing upon major issues.

Personnel: Merrimon Cuninggim, President; Laura Bornholdt, John H. Chandler, J. Edward Dirks, Robert Rankin, and Gene L. Schwilck, Vice Presidents; Melvin C. Bahle, Comptroller.

Publications: Danforth News and Notes (occasional); Annual Report.

Name: Esso Education Foundation
49 West 49th Street
New York, N. Y. 10020

Incorporation: New Jersey, 1955, with donations from the Standard Oil Company of New Jersey and affiliated companies.

Description: To aid higher education in the United States through unrestricted and capital grants to regionally accredited four-year private colleges and universities; research and development grants to public and private colleges and universities and education associations for specific projects; SPUR (Support for Promoting the Utilization of Resources) grants to public and private colleges and universities and education associations for experiments in innovations in undergraduate education.

Financial Data: (year ended 30 June 1970) Assets, $5,621,299; gifts received, $1,290,500; expenditures, $3,226,040, including $3,153,793 for 366 grants.

Recent Grants: Numerous grants, each under the maximum of $75,000, have been made through the foundation program called Support for Promoting the Utilization of Resources (SPUR). Program underwrites experiments that promise to lead to more efficient and effective use of instructional, administrative, and physical resources of colleges and universities. Eligible programs must be innovative, efficient, effective, continuous, and be duplicable on other campuses. Grants are awarded in the categories of instruction, administration, and physical facilities. Examples of recent grants: Improved use of teaching assistants, University of Rochester; utilization of video-tape and peer group evaluation in the preparation of graduate teaching assistants, Michigan State University; multi-media simulations in engineering, Northeastern University; group counselling for underachievers, Illinois Institute of Technology.

Personnel: M.N. Brisco, President; Frederick de W. Bolman, Executive Director; V.J. Motto, Treasurer.

Name: Ford Foundation
320 East 43 Street
New York, N. Y. 10007

Incorporation: Michigan, 1936, with donations from Henry and Edsel Ford.

Description: Grants to advance the public welfare are distributed primarily to institutions for experimental, administrative, and developmental efforts that are likely to produce significant advancements within the Foundation's fields of interests: improvement of educational quality and opportunity in schools, colleges, and universities, including research and experimentation in curriculum, school and university organization and management, training of teachers and administrators, research on learning, and work on educational financing; community development; law and the administration of justice; resources and environment; intergroup relations; conflict resolution; social, economic and educational opportunity for minority groups; local, state, and regional affairs; housing; social and economic research; public television; humanities and the arts; population research and family planning action.

Financial Data: (year ended 30 September 1970) Assets, $2,901,547,711; expenditures, $282,675,684, including $239,448,608 for 1730 grants and 34,873,961 for program.

Recent Grants: $74,300 to Theatre Communications Group, New York, for consulting services for resident theatre; $44,148 for Harvard University to study and develop projects for changing the speech of pre-school children; $19,570 to the University of California Language Behavior Research Laboratory for research on language development in black and Mexican-American children; $225,000 to the Business Committee for the Arts for general support; $300,000 to the Linguistic Society of America to strengthen the central organization and operate summer linguistics institutes; $410,000 to George Washington University, Washington, D.C., to establish an Institute for Educational Leadership; $32,000 to Stanford University for research and

Publications: The Occasional; (occasional) Annual Report.

writing two books: "Instructional Television" and "The Theory of Communication"; $24,065 to the University of California for research on the relationship between children's language ability and school performance; $25,000 to Massachusetts Institute of Technology for a study of the first decade of satellite communications covering the legal and political aspects as well as technological and instructional developments.

Personnel: McGeorge Bundy, President; David E. Bell, Executive Vice President; Howard R. Dressner, Secretary; Thomas H. Lenagh, Treasurer.

Publications: Ford Foundation Letter (eight times a year); Annual Report.

Name: Johnson Foundation, Inc.
Racine, Wisconsin 53401

Incorporation: New York, 1958, with donations from S.C. Johnson and Son, Inc., and members of the Johnson Family.

Description: Supports projects that promote international understanding, educational excellence, intellectual and cultural growth, and improvement of the human environment. Program includes grants in named areas and support for conference programs, usually held in cooperation with other educational institutions at Wingspread, the Foundation's conference center.

Financial Data: (year ended 30 June 1968) Assets, $3,334,812; gifts received, $1, 128, 025; expenditures, $726,703, including $332,055 for conferences and $282,154 for 75 grants.

Recent Grants: The Foundation recently contributed to the Speech Communication Association's National Developmental Project on Rhetoric by providing conference support for the first of the project's two meetings at the Johnson Foundation's Wingspread Conference Center, Racine, Wisconsin, January 25-27, 1970.

Personnel: Roy W. Johnson, President; Viola A. Johnson, Vice President; Armin M. Elbert, Secretary.

Publications: None.

Name: W.K. Kellogg Foundation
400 North Avenue
Battle Creek, Michigan 49016

Incorporation: Michigan, 1930, with a donation from W.K. Kellogg.

Description: Chartered for general educational and charitable purposes with aid largely limited to programs concerned with the application of knowledge rather than its creation through basic research.

Financial Data: (year ended 31 August 1970) Assets, $392,596,908; expenditures, $16,835,799, including $16,031,302 for 247 grants.

Recent Grants: $1,524,000 to Case Western Reserve University to establish a health sciences communication center; $400,000 to the Interuniversity Communications Council to develop techniques of communication and information storage and retrieval in biological sciences; $235,300 to the American Association of Higher Education to develop a national communications program.

Publications: Annual Report.

Name: Charles F. Kettering Foundation
5335 Far Hills Avenue, Suite 300
Dayton, Ohio 05429

Incorporation: Ohio, 1927, with a donation from Charles F. Kettering.

Description: To enhance the quality of life that man enjoys through support of new projects to achieve constructive change in education, to improve the use and increase knowledge of the biological sciences, to strengthen the mechanisms for science and participation in public policy formation and implementation, and to support the forces for world order and peace. Interested in innovative, high-risk programs which do not receive sufficient attention from other sources.

Financial Data: (year ended 31 August 1970) Assets, $93,298,947, expenditures, $4, 842,554, including $4,203,916 for 33 grants.

Recent Grants: $23,250 to Ohio State University to study motivation of human behavior; $22,404 to Robert J. Blakeley, for a book on public television; $10,000 to the Institute for Creative Studies for a study of campus unrest.

Publications: Annual Report.

Name: John and Mary R. Markle Foundation
50 Rockefellar Plaza, Suite 940
New York, N. Y. 10020

Incorporation: New York, 1927, with a donation from John Markle.

Description: To promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge among the people of the United States and to promote the general good of mankind. Major interest has shifted from medical education to the educational uses of mass media and communication technology; grants for research and studies, educational programs and special projects to foster better understanding of the media and improve their educational service.

Financial Data: (year ended 30 June 1970) Assets, $41,151,633; gifts received $621,592; expenditures, $1,361,107, including $1,060,000 for about 70 grants.

Recent Grants: $250,000 to the Mitre Corporation for an analysis of the impact of city-wide cable television on the citizens and institutions of Washington, D.C.; $340,000 to the Society of Neuro Surgeons Research Foundation to improve neuro surgical communications through television.

Personnel: Lloyd N. Morrisett, President; Marianne Keating, Secretary; Jarvis Cromwell, Treasurer; Forrest P. Chisman, Executive Assistant.

Publications: Annual Report.

Name: Andrew W. Mellon Foundation
140 East 62 Street
New York, N. Y. 10021

Incorporation: Formerly the Avalon Foundation, Delaware, 1940; incorporated in New York, 1954; merged with the Old Dominion Foundation and renamed the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation in 1969. Donors: Alisa Mellon Bruce and Paul Mellon.

Description: General support for education, health, and medicine; culture projects and institutions; conservation, civic programs, and community services.

Financial Data: (year ended 31 December 1969) Assets, $233,828,072; gifts received, $50,000; expenditures, $12,157,072, including $11,413,274 for 212 grants. Recent acquisitions have brought assets to approximately $698,000,000.

Recent Grants: $60,000 to the Associated Councils of the Arts for general support; $300,000 to Cornell University for support for the Society for the Humanities; $32,500 to Carnegie-Mellon University, Department of Drama, to develop a theatre dance program.

Personnel: Charles S. Hamilton, Jr., President; Albert O-B. Andrews, Vice President, and Secretary; Kenneth J. Herr, Treasurer.

Publications: Annual Report.

Name: Rockefeller Foundation
111 West 50th Street
New York, N. Y. 10020

Incorporation: New York, 1913, with a donation from John D. Rockefeller.

Description: To promote the well being of mankind throughout the world. Concentrates in six areas of fundamental importance: The conquest of hunger and its attended ills, the solution of problems of population, the strengthening of emerging centers of learning in developing countries for all, cultural development, and improvements in the quality of the environment. Operates primarily through grants to universities, research institutes, and other qualified agencies. No grants for establishment, building, or operation of local institutions, for personal aid to individuals or for appraising or subsidizing cures or inventions.

Financial Data: (year ended 31 December 1969) Assets, $757,088,188; gifts received $25,101; expenditures $38,932,927, including $27,318,015 for about 1500 grants and $8,695,182 for program.

Recent Grants: $75,000 to the Twin City Area Educational Television Corporation for a television series "Black Voices;" $200,000 to the Business Committee for the Arts to encourage support for the arts by the business community; $25,000 to Yale University School of Drama for a research workshop in theatre; $15,000 to the University of Washington School of Drama for participation of great directors in major dramatic productions; $100,000 to the American Council of Learned Societies for general support.

Personnel: Dana S. Creel, President; Robert C. Bates, Vice-President and Secretary; Gene W. Setzer, Vice-President; David G. Fernale, Treasurer.

Publications: The Rockefeller Foundation Quarterly; Annual Report.

Name: Shell Companies Foundation, Inc.
50 West 50th Street, Staff Office
New York, N. Y. 10020

Incorporation: New York, 1953, with a donation from Shell Oil Company and subsidiaries.

Description: Broad purposes; contributes largely to community funds in areas in which Shell employees reside; substantial support for education with some emphasis on the advancement of pre-college science and mathematics teaching and national educational associations.

Financial Data: (year ended 31 December 1969) Assets, $4,696,970; gifts received, $500,001; expenditures $2,634,362, including $2,619,494 for about 950 grants.

Recent Grants: 185 institutions received contributions of $1500 for general support; support for numerous educational associations including the American Association of Junior Colleges, Association of American Colleges, Council For Financial Aid to Education, Inc., and the Council on Social Work Education.

Personnel: D.B. Kambell-Cook, President; W.N. Upchurch, Jr., Senior Vice President; Charles E. Parker, Jr., Secretary.

Publications: Annual Report.

Name: Whitney Foundation
20 Broad Street
New York, N. Y. 10005

Incorporation: New York, 1936, Mr. Leonard K. Elmhirst.

Description: General education and charitable purposes with most support going to projects concerned with higher and secondary education, international understanding, the performing arts, conservation, urban affairs, and social agencies. Generally, grants are made only to organizations requiring assistance in their formative period.

Financial Data: (year ended 31 December 1969) Assets, $1,211,013; expenditures, $94,624, including $72,915 for 36 grants.

Recent Grants: $2,500 to the H.B. Playwrites Foundation, Inc., for general support; $1,000 to the Harlem Cultural Council, Inc., for the Afro-American Studio for Acting and Speech; $1,000 to the National Endowment for the Humanities to support the educational television production of "Cherokee: The Trail of Tears"; $1,000 to the New Theatre Workshop, Inc., for general support; $2,500 to the National Citizens Committee for Broadcasting, to support a national conference on citizens rights in broadcasting.

Personnel: Michael W. Straight, President; Milton C. Rose, Vice President; Norman H. Morse, Secretary and Treasurer.

Publications: Annual Report.

SECURING A FOUNDATION GRANT

In the remaining pages, we shall offer some miscellaneous comments on the subject of securing foundation funding for your research or development project. We will not deal with the subject of how to write a research proposal. A number of excellent guides, some of them listed in the bibliography, offer succinct advice on the subject. Instead, we will deal with more general but vital matters of strategy and approach that may be useful to the speech communication researcher.

Identifying Appropriate Funding Agencies

Having established a clear outline of the project for which you are about to solicit funds, the first step in securing a grant is to identify appropriate foundations or businesses to which you might apply for support. All too often, researchers armed with a quality proposal consider the major well-known national foundations such as Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie the most likely funding sources since they seem to be the most active of the foundations and they are certainly among the richest. Such researchers concentrate all of their efforts at securing a grant from a major national foundation and bypass smaller, more promising foundations. While major national foundations may, indeed, be likely prospects for funding your research project, they should not be considered the only likely funding agencies. Frequently, smaller foundations which confine their grant activities to smaller projects within a limited range of subjects or a restricted geographical area are more likely donors since they receive fewer solicitations and are not as adamant in demanding national or international impact or significance.

Smaller, lesser known foundations are now easily identified. A good starting point is the office of the State's Attorney General. There, a file of all tax-exempt foundations chartered within the state will be available for public inspection. The Attorney General's office will have a description of the purposes for which the foundation was formed, the names of high level officials and, most likely, will also have recent copies of foundation publications, reports, and financial records. Such data will lead to valid inferences conderning the potential interest of a given smaller foundation to the project you wish to propose.

A second important source of information about appropriate foundations, as we mentioned earlier, is the Internal Revenue Service. Copies of Form 990-A, submitted annually by every active

foundation, large or small, are available for inspection at the Foundation Library Center and its regional repositories. It is better to check the Center's files than to rely on the Foundation Directory since the Directory does not list small local or regional foundations which may be your most likely funding source.

A third source of information on smaller foundations as well as the big ones is the established research office in major colleges and universities throughout the country. In most cases, the official research officer of your institution can provide valuable advice concerning many of the active smaller foundations and corporate contributors in a given locality. Needless to say, informal solicitation among one's academic colleagues is also in order and frequently yields useful advice and information.

If your search for potential sources of revenue suggests that the smaller foundations are not the answer, a careful perusal of recent issues of Foundation News, published bimonthly by the Council of Foundations, may yield more favorable results. Major foundation grants in various categories (see appendix) are published regularly along with commentary and analysis on issues of relevance to the foundation world. If nothing more, Foundation News should lead you to tentative inferences concerning which foundations might be interested in considering your proposal.

Several other miscellaneous points about foundation funding practices should be kept in mind. Many foundations are reluctant or steadfastly refuse to award grants for capital equipment, general support, validating of inventions, or aid to individuals. All, of course, are bound by their chartered purposes, and many publish a list of fundable priorities. Many smaller foundations are frequently more receptive to appeals for general support, buildings and equipment, and other kinds of projects generally not considered by the larger foundations.

If you plan to extend your search for funds directly to the business world, several resources are available in addition to those already mentioned. Either through its publications or through personal correspondence, the Council for Financial Aid to Education may provide useful information although it is not a funding agency itself, nor will it direct you toward any specific funding sources. Similarly, the economic development agency of your state and/or local community, your local chamber of commerce, and the yellow pages of your phone directory may provide useful information.

Mary Hall, in Developing Skills in Proposal Writing, suggests the following questions be utilized in determining which

foundations to approach for funds:

1. Does the foundation make awards to groups outside the state in which it was located?

2. Does the foundation support public and/or private agencies and institutions?

3. What are its current program priorities?

4. Does it have a maximum ceiling on the amount it will award?

5. When does its board of trustees meet and how far in advance of this should a project be submitted?

6. Does it provide funds for equipment and facilities?

7. Does it prefer to provide funds for pilot or innovative projects or to make contributions to the ongoing program of an agency or institution?

8. Does it have a regional representative in a local area? This is relevant only to national foundations.[7]

Initial Explorations

When you have identified several foundations which, according to the information at your disposal, might be interested in funding the research and development project you have in mind, the next step in the funding process might be labelled initial exploration. Most foundations do not use official "application forms". Thus, a letter to the most appropriate foundation officer is recommended.

It is important that initial contact, in most cases, be made in writing. The exploratory letter should identify the specific needs the proposed project is designed to meet, the objectives of that project, the procedures to be utilized, and anticipated costs and personnel, and anticipated results. The letter should be brief, cogent, and developed in plain language rather than "jargonese."

Your exploratory letter, of course, should include the name of your organization, a description of that organization when it is deemed necessary, and some comment concerning the appropriateness

---

[7] Mary Hall, Developing Skills in Proposal Writing 41.

of your project to the foundation's current objectives. In evaluating your exploratory letter, foundation personnel will frequently be looking for evidence of any one of the following deficiencies in many initial proposals:

1. Insignificant explanation of the significance of the project

2. Absence of provisions for national or at least substantial impact.

3. Limited evidence of careful planning, thought and coordination.

4. Poor integration of component parts; failure to relate problem objectives and procedures adequately.

5. Absence of clarity and consiseness in writing.

6. Unrealistic budget--not commensurate with expected results.

A more complete listing of typical proposal deficiencies is found in the appendix.

A popular fund raising strategy of yesteryear was to formalize a general project precis and blanket the foundation world with letters of initial inquiry. Such a procedure has always been questionable at best and is anathema to astute fund raisers of today. One of the principal objectives of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 was to induce greater accountability on the part of foundations, particularly smaller foundations whose operating procedures have been subject to recent public criticism. A four percent tax on foundation investment income has been leveled by the Act in order to finance a more rigorous scrutiny of foundation procedures. Consequently, managers of even smaller benevolent funds are now demanding increased accountability from grant recipients. They insist on carefully developed preliminary plans, personal interaction with recipients as the project is implemented, careful accounting of the expenditure of foundation funds, and formally prepared final reports demonstrating contractual consistency and project impact. Undergirded by the accountability principle, foundation executives responsible for reviewing initial letters of inquiry are alert to subtle evidence of irresponsibility reflected in letters of inquiry that appear to be mass distributed to a mailing list of foundations. Such procedures rarely work today and should be avoided.

Although it seems to be belaboring the obvious, such practices as timing the submission of a letter of inquiry so that it is received appropriately ahead of the meeting of the foundation director

addressing the letters of inquiry personally to the foundation officer who is most appropriate, and reflecting a thorough acquaintance with the fundamental policies and procedures of the foundation to which you are applying are all strategies which yield positive results.

Foundations vary as to procedures utilized in evaluating your proposal and administering the subsequent grant. Some of the larger foundations have adopted a formal evaluation-implementation sequence that has become standard operating procedure for much of the foundation world. That sequence is charted in the appendix.

Conclusion

Public disenchantment with foundation philanthropy, stimulated by the kind of public criticism reflected in Joseph C. Goulden's The Money Givers and the bitter debates that prefaced the Tax Reform Act of 1969, has put the foundation world in a state of flux that is producing substantial changes in foundation philanthropic behavior. Economic experts are predicting the demise of many small foundations which, in the past, have served more as tax dodges for their wealthy funders than as contributors to the public good. The demise will be accomplished by the new four percent excise tax on foundation net investment income, and legal requirements such as full public disclosure of foundation expenditures, prohibitions against self-dealing, a twenty percent limitation on ownership of any corporation, and a required six percent annual payout on assets by 1975.

It is also predicted that the Tax Act of 1969 will stimulate the expansion of the community foundation, the pooling of resources of smaller foundations to acquire more efficient management of funds, and an increased level of giving on the part of many foundations combined with more efficient management of revenue investments.

In spite of the fact that the foundation world is experiencing profound public pressures and undergoing rapid and sometimes traumatic changes, the level of foundation giving which has risen steadily in the past is expected to continue its ascent in the future. And education will more than likely continue to claim the largest portion of foundation contributions, rendering foundation philanthropy a continued vital source of revenue for the educational research and development specialist.

We find no evidence to indicate that the substantial absence of foundation funded speech communication projects is indicative of any dominant bias against the discipline on the part of foundations. More than likely, it is simply reflective of the fact that

few soundly conceived attempts have been made at securing foundation support for projects within the field. The literature of the foundation world suggests that many foundations, chartered for general educational purposes, would welcome soundly conceived proposals from representatives of the speech communication community.

Appendix A

FOUNDATION CENTER LIBRARIES

Library	Area Served
The Foundation Center 888 Seventh Avenue New York, N. Y. 10019	All states and D.C.
Branch Office 1001 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, D. C. 20036	All states and D.C.
Graduate Social Science Library Stephens Hall University of California Berkeley, California 94720	California, Idaho, Nevada, Washington, Oregon
Reference Department Library (Foundation Collection) University of California Los Angeles, California 90024	California, Arizona
Foundation Library Collection Atlanta Public Library 126 Carnegie Way, N.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30303	Alabama, Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Mississippi
The Newberry Library 60 West Walton Street Chicago, Illinois 60610	Illinois
The Danforth Foundation Library 222 South Central Avenue St. Louis, Missouri 63105	Kansas, Missouri
Cleveland Foundation Library 700 National City Bank Building Cleveland, Ohio 44114	Ohio
Regional Foundation Library The Hogg Foundation for Mental Health The University of Texas Austin, Texas 78712	Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, New Mexico, Oklahoma

Appendix B

GRANT CATEGORIES REPORTED IN
FOUNDATION NEWS

I. Education

- A. Elementary and Secondary Education
- B. Higher Education
  - 1. General Support
  - 2. Special Projects
- C. Adult Education
- D. Vocational Education
- E. Personnel Development
- F. Scholarships and Loans
- G. Fellowships
- H. Communications
- I. Educational Research
- J. Endowment
- K. Libraries
- L. Educational Associations
- M. Buildings and Equipment
- N. Medical Education

III. Humanities

- A. General
- B. Art and Architecture
- C. History
- D. Literature and Language
- E. Museums
- F. Music
- G. Performing Arts

II. Health

- A. Mental Health
- B. Dentistry
- C. Nursing
- D. Public Health
- E. Medical Care and Rehabilitation
- F. Hospitals
- G. Health Agencies

IV. International Activities

- A. Education
- B. International Studies
- C. Exchange of Persons
- D. Cultural Relations
- E. Peace and International Cooperation
- F. Health and Welfare
- G. Relief and Refugees
- H. Technical Assistance

V. Religion

- A. Religious Education
- B. Theological Education
- C. Religious Welfare
- D. Religious Associations
- E. Churches and Temples
- F. Buildings and Equipment

VI. Science and Technology

- A. General
  - 1. Physical Sciences
    - a. Chemistry
    - b. Earth Sciences and Oceanography
    - c. Mathematics
    - d. Physics
  - 2. Life Sciences
    - a. Environmental Studies
    - b. Agriculture
    - c. Biology
    - d. Medical Research
  - 3. Social Sciences
    - a. General
    - b. Anthropology and Archaeology
    - c. Business and Labor
    - d. Economics
    - e. Political Science
    - f. Law
    - g. Psychology
    - h. Sociology
  - 4. Technology

VII. Welfare

- A. Child Welfare
- B. Youth Agencies
- C. Aged
- D. Handicapped
- E. Race Relations
- F. Delinquency and Crime
- G. Community Development
- H. Housing and Transportation
- I. Recreation
- J. Social Agencies
- K. Community Funds

Appendix C

PROCESSING A FOUNDATION GRANT:
EVALUATION-IMPLEMENTATION SEQUENCE *

I. INITIAL SCREENING
- A. Assignment to a staff person
- B. Determine sufficiency of information
- C. Size of request in relation to Foundation's income
- D. Development of project folder
- E. Determine relationship of request to Foundation's policy and program focus
- F. Eligibility
  1. Foundation policy
  2. IRS tax ruling
- G. Determination as to whether to handle as a staff reject or complete study for Board action

II. REVIEW BY STAFF OF FOUNDATION
- A. Further study of relationship of proposal to Foundation's policy and program focus. Staff judgements on priorities
- B. Staff seeks professional and specialized consultation if necessary
- C. Tax status of applicant (consultation with attorney if necessary) is determined Implications of a grant upon the prospective donee's tax status.
- D. Consideration of applicant's ability to successfully execute project, including qualifications of key personnel
- E. Evaluation of the utility and promise of project
- F. Time table and cost estimates
- G. Analysis of funding plan: Potential for funding elsewhere? Will grant be a one-time only or a recurring request? Has proposal been rejected by other sources of funding and, if so, why?
- H. Does it complement other projects of the Foundation
- I. Dialogue with the applicant and principals of project

Robert W. Bonnie, "One Part Science, One Part Art," Foundation News, XII (November, 1971), 247.

J. Site visit if necessary
K. Does project unnecessarily duplicate efforts of other organizations and individuals
L. Decision-
   1. To hold for further study
   2. To recommend to Board that proposal be approved or rejected
   3. To proceed with Staff rejection with Board approval

III. PREPARATION OF PROPOSAL FOR BOARD ACTION
A. Summary of proposal for distribution to Directors in advance of Board meeting which includes: (1) history of similar projects; (2) statement of relation to overall policies and program; (3) possible budget alternatives; (4) staff recommendations

IV. BOARD ACTION
A. Discussion in light of knowledge, experience and interests of Directors and of Foundation's policy and program focus
B. Board action-
   1. Approval or rejection
   2. Approve with conditions
   3. Refer back to Staff for further study

V. NOTIFYING APPLICANT
A. Addition to project folder to reflect Board action
B. If grant is approved, notification to Fiscal Agent, and Bookkeeping Department. Preparation of appropriate letter of notification to grantee with copies to appropriate persons setting forth:
   1. Clear statement of grant and purpose
   2. Length of time covered
   3. Outline of items funded
   4. Pay-out schedule
   5. Agreement on schedule of payments and request grantee approval or recommendation for changes
   6. Special conditions, if any
   7. Name of Staff member to contact person
   8. Requirement of semi-annual and final financial and progress reports

9. Assurance that program will not violate 1969 tax law and IRS regulations-enclosure of statement about requirements under law and Foundation policy
10. Request grantee to release grant information to appropriate media

C. Letter from grantee acknowledging the grant and agreement to grant conditions
D. Transmitting payments as per shcedule
E. Notification to applicant if request has been declined

VI. STAFF FOLLOW-UP
A. Possible site visit
B. Review of progress reports
1. Consider any request of grantee for changes and determine which will require Board action
C. Review of final narrative report
D. Review of disbursement reports and comparisons with original budget
E. Request for return of unencumbered balances upon termination of grant
F. Request for an audit if necessary under law
G. Cancel unpaid commitments at termination of proposal

VII. REPORTING
A. Annual written report published by the Foundation and made available to the public
B. Semi-annual and final report received from the grantee and reviewed with Directors when appropriate
C. Response to inquiries and exchange of information with National Council on Philanthropy, Council on Foundations, Foundation Center, etc.
D. Required reports filed with IRS

VIII. CLOSING FILE
A. Make certain that project folder contains all correspondence, reports, and data required by the Foundation and by IRS
B. Microfilming and storage as per schedule
C. Preparation for retrieval

Appendix D

SHORTCOMINGS FOUND IN RESEARCH PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY NATURAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENTISTS

The table that follows is based on an analysis of shortcomings found in 605 disapproved research grant applications submitted to the Public Health Service of the Department of Health Education, and Welfare. All percentages are to the base number 605. The criticisms far down the list in each of the four categories are clearly of less importance than the leading items with the higher percentages, and in some instances would obviously not in themselves warrant disapproval of an application. This table could well be used as a check list for criticisms of research grant applications by the investigator himself prior to formal submission.

It is important to keep in mind that this analysis is based ON WHAT IS ON PAPER. That is all the evidence the people in Washington possess. Many of these "shortcomings" are not real weaknesses, but only a reflection of a poorly expressed or sketchy proposal.

No.	Shortcomings	Percentage
	THE PROBLEM (58 percent)	
1	The problem is of insufficient importance or unlikely to produce any new or useful information	33.1%
2	The proposed research is based on a hypothesis that rests on insufficient evidence, is doubtful, or is unsound.....	8.9
3	The problem is more complex than the investigator appears to realize.....	8.1
4	The problem has only local significance, or is one of production control, or otherwise fails to fall sufficiently clearly within the general fields of health-related research.....	4.8
5	The problem is scientifically premature and warrants, at most, only a pilot study.....	3.1
6	The research as proposed is overly involved, with too many elements under simultaneous investigation	3.0
7	The description of the nature of the research and of its significance leaves the proposal nebulous and diffuse and without clear research aim.....	2.6

THE APPROACH (73 percent)

1 The proposed tests, or methods, or scientific procedures are unsuited to the stated objective	34.7%
2 The description of the approach is too nebulous, diffuse, and lacking in clarity to permit adequate evaluation	20.8
3 The overall design of the study has not been carefully thought out	14.7
4 The statistical aspects of the approach have not been given sufficient consideration	8.1
5 The approach lacks scientific imagination	7.4
6 Controls are either inadequately conceived or inadequately described	6.8
7 The material the investigator proposes to use is unsuited to the objectives of the study or is difficult to obtain	3.8
8 The number of observations is unsuitable	2.5
9 The equipment contemplated is outmoded or otherwise unsuitable	1.0

THE MAN (55 percent)

1 The investigator does not appear to have adequate experience or training, or both, for this research	32.6%
2 The investigator appears to be unfamiliar with recent pertinent literature or methods, or both	13.7
3 The investigator's previously published work in this field does not appear to inspire confidence	12.6
4 The investigator proposes to rely too heavily on insufficiently experienced associates	5.0
5 The investigator is spreading himself too thin; he will be more productive if he concentrates on fewer projects	3.8
6 The investigator needs more liason with colleagues in this field or in collateral fields	1.7

OTHER (16 percent)

1 The requirements for equipment or personnel, or both, are unrealistic	10.1%
2 It appears that other responsibilities would prevent devotion of sufficient time and attention to this research	3.0

3 The institutional setting is unfavorable.....	2.3
4 Research grants to the investigator, now in force, are adequate in scope and amount to cover the proposed research.....	1.5

Appendix E

GRANTS OF $10,000 OR MORE REPORTED IN FOUNDATION NEWS, 1961 THROUGH 1970, BY MAJOR FIELDS *

Dollar figures in millions

Fields	1961 Amount	1961 %	1962 Amount	1962 %	1963 Amount	1963 %
Education	$107	31	$145	46	$83	26
International Activities	62	17	52	17	82	25
Health	68	19	32	10	35	11
Welfare	43	12	20	6	24	7
Sciences	37	11	45	14	47	14
Humanities	25	7	16	5	48	15
Religion	9	3	5	2	5	2
Totals	$351	100	$316	100	$324	100

Fields	1964 Amount	1964 %	1965 Amount	1965 %	1966 Amount	1966 %
Education	$186	33	$164	25	$157	24
International Activities	74	13	128	20	141	21
Health	129	23	103	16	62	9
Welfare	44	8	104	16	81	12
Sciences	58	11	60	9	69	11
Humanities	39	7	39	6	117	18
Religion	26	5	51	8	34	5
Totals	$556	100	$649	100	$661	100

* Lewis, vi, xvii

Fields	1967 Amount	%	1968 Amount	%	1969 Amount	%
Education	$191	33	$308	41	$202	30
International Activities	84	15	93	12	75	11
Health	81	14	77	10	106	16
Welfare	82	14	74	10	102	15
Sciences	79	13	106	14	114	17
Humanities	39	7	73	10	37	5
Religion	24	4	23	3	41	6
Totals	$579	100	$753	100	$677	100

Fields	1970 Amount	%	Total Amount	%
Education	$281	36	$1,824	32
International Activities	59	7	850	15
Health	121	15	814	14
Welfare	136	17	710	13
Sciences	93	12	708	12
Humanities	52	7	485	9
Religion	51	6	269	5
Totals	$793	100	$5,660	100

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following bibliography is not intended to be comprehensive but rather representative of published sources available to the speech communication researcher seeking funds within the private sector. Nonetheless, most major sources of information have been included. Much of the material reflected in this bibliography is frequently available in the offices of university research administrators as well as the regional offices of the Foundation Library Center. Specific foundation reports and periodicals, such as the Ford Foundation Letter, have been omitted.

Books and Pamphlets

Aid-to-Education Programs of Some Leading Business Concerns. Seventh Edition. New York: Council for Financial Aid to Education, 1970.

Andrews, Emerson, Philanthropic Foundations. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1956

_____ Foundations: 20 Viewpoints. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

Buchtel, Foster S., A Basic Guide for the Preparation and Submission of Proposals for Research Support. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Western Michigan University, 1970.

Community Foundations in the United States and Canada. Second Edition. New York: National Council on Community Foundations, Inc., (Now Council on Foundations, Inc.) 1961.

Fosdick, Raymond B., Adventures in Giving: The Story of the General Education Board. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Fremont-Smith, Marion R., Foundations and Government: State and Federal Law and Supervision. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1965.

Goulden, Joseph C., The Money Givers. New York: Random House, 1971.

Hall, Mary, Developing Skills in Proposal Writing. Corvallis, Oregon: Office of Federal Relations, Oregon State University, 1971.

Hall, Mary Jo, and Frank, Robert E., Sources of Information on Funds. Corvallis, Oregon: Office of Federal Relations, Oregon State University, 1969.

Kruthwahl, Donald R., How to Prepare a Research Proposal. Fifty page brochure available from the Speech Communication Association. Price: $1.00, postpaid.

Lewis, Marianna O., ed., The Foundation Directory. Fourth Edition. New York: Columbia University Press, 1971. Price: $15.00 postpaid.

Marts, Arnoud C., The Generosity of Americans. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Philanthropic Foundations in the United States. New York: Foundation Center, 1969. Free printed brochure.

Private Foundations Active in the Arts. Washington, D.C.: International Arts Letter, Box 9005, Washington, D.C., 20003, 1971. Price: $17.50.

Rudy, William H., The Foundations: Their Use and Abuse. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1970.

Urgo, Louis A., and Corcoran, Robert J., A Manual for Obtaining Foundation Grants. Boston: Robert J. Corocran Company, 1971.

Weaver, Warren, U.S. Philanthropic Foundations. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Weithorn, Stanley S., "Summary of the Tax Reform Act as it Affects Foundations," Foundation News, XI (May, 1970), 85-89.

Young, Donald R., and Moore, Wilbert E., Trusteeships and the Management of Foundations. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.

Bulletins, Newsletters, Periodicals

A.E.T.A. Theatre News. (9-12 Times Yearly) American Educational Theatre Association, Suite 500, 1317 F Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20004. Available to AETA members.

Covers general theatre news including relevant research reports and important developments in the areas of funding and Federal legislation.

Arts Reporting Service. (Biweekly) 1230 13th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005. Annual subscription: $25.00.

Reports general news relevant to all of the arts including important meetings and events, analysis of trends, and matters of legislation and finance.

Behavior Today. (Weekly) Communications/Research/Machines, Inc., Del Mar, California 92014. Annual subscription: $20.00. Subscription correspondence: Box 2993, Boulder, Colorado 80302.

Covers latest developments in the behavioral sciences including legislations, organization activities, major grant programs, and personnel activities.

Chronicle of Higher Education. (Weekly during the academic year) Editorial Projects for Education, 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Annual subscription: $20.00.

A thorough, well-written higher education newspaper covering the national scene from Capitol Hill to personnel news. Includes a periodic "foundation grants" column.

College and University Bulletin. (Semi-monthly) American Association for Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036. Annual subscription: $5.00.

Covers major educational research programs and personnel.

Education-Training Market Report. (Biweekly) E.F. Shelley and Company, Inc., 1730 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Annual subscription: $40.00.

Federal Notes. (Twice Monthly) Office of Federal Relations, Extension Hall Annex, University Campus, Corvallis, Oregon 97331. Annual subscription: $17.00.

A comprehensive coverage of national programs and trends relevant to the educational fund raiser.

Foundation News. (Bimonthly) Council on Foundations, 393 Seventh Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10001. Annual subscription: $10.00.

Invaluable feature articles, analysis, statistical data, personnel information, and catalog of major foundation grants. The bible!

Higher Education and National Affairs. (app. 40 times a year) American Council of Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C., 20036. Annual subscription: $25.00.

The latest data on important legislation, programs, finances and personnel--clear, succinct, accurate.

NEAB Newsletter. (Biweekly) National Association of Educational Broadcasters, 1346 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Available to NEAB members. New members annual subscription: $10.00.

Covers legislative and funding matters pertinent to educational broadcasters.

Report. (Biweekly) Capital Publications, Inc., Suite G-12, 2430 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037. Annual subscription: $40.00.

Reports on matters relevant to basic and applied researchers.

Spectra. (Bimonthly) Speech Communication Association, Statler Hilton Hotel, New York, N. Y. 10001. Available to SCA members. Non-member annual subscription: $2.50.

Includes a "Research Notes" section that reports recent grants to speech communication researchers and other relevant information.